THE EXPOSITORY TIMES

Notes of Recent Exposition

Not long ago 'Studies in Ephesians' would have meant studies in Biblical criticism, narrowly conceived. They would have dealt with questions of authorship, style, structure, etc. These were proper studies, and remain so. No satisfactory volume could be written on the letter which ignored them. Nor does the latest one—*Studies in Ephesians*, written by a group of Anglican scholars and edited by Professor F. L. Cross.[1] Indeed, the first two chapters face them explicitly, but the book's main emphases lie elsewhere. Doubtful authorship is of less moment than undoubted authorship, and the question, 'What is Ephesians?' is subordinated to the other one, 'What has Ephesians to say?' The stress falls thus upon the theological and practical—and, we may add, upon the practical as grounded in the theological. In fine, this book mirrors memorably the Biblical concern of our time.

Chapters 1 and 2 set forth simply and clearly the pros and cons of the Pauline authorship of Ephesians. J. N. Sanders stands by strong tradition and by Paul: D. E. Nineham accepts Mitton's cumulative argument, and rejects the tradition. To our mind, cumulative argument has one inherent defect. Straws enough to build a house can at best only build a house of straw. Or is this mere verbal cleverness?

The Christology of Ephesians occupies D. E. H. Whiteley in ch. 4. Properly proceeding from Christ's work to His Person, he follows sound, if familiar, paths in developing his theme. Christ is Lord in, as it were, 'three tenses'—in creation, in His historic saving activity, and in His coming Parousia. Most interesting, perhaps, of his passing observations is his proposal to 'remythologize' the 'demonic' passages (1^{10} 2^{2} and 6^{12}). These he translates and renames as nationalism, class loyalty (when pressed too far) and even æsthetic appreciation, family life and professional success: 'good in themselves but dangerous idols unless made subject to Christ.' Quite a thinking-point!

In ch. 5 Father Bedale writes on 'The Theology of the Church,' and in ch. 6 C. P. M. Jones on 'The Calling of the Gentiles.' Good as they are, we have no space to discuss them in detail, except to mention Father Bedale's 'hunch' that we have quite misinterpreted Paul's metaphor about the 'Head.' We usually take it to mean the controlling and unifying power of the organism which is the Church. But is this not a hopeless anachronism? In Paul's day a man reasoned not with his 'head' (*kephalē*) but in his 'heart' (*kardia*). Possibly, then, when Paul used the metaphor of the 'Head' he was using it in the sense discoverable in the Septuagint of 'origin' or 'principle of being.' And does not this meaning ease the interpretation of such passages as Col 1^{18} 2^{19}, Eph 4^{15} and especially 5^{21} ff.?

The shortest chapter (ch. 7, 'The Pauline Catechesis'), by the Bishop of Leicester, leaves us less convinced than Dr. Williams that Ephesians is a baptismal homily. No matter! His succinct exposition of the Epistle shows finely the interdependence in Ephesians of 'the indicative and the imperative,' the authentic Biblical pattern we might express as, 'This has God done: thus therefore do!' As he proceeds, Dr. Williams throws wise light on several points: on, for example, the empirical, 'evangelistic' order of the credal passage in 4^{4-6}, and on the peroration about the Christian's panoply (6^{10-20}). This he aptly calls a 'Call to Conflict' climax (like the singing of 'Soldiers of Christ, arise,' at the close of a Confirmation service): a summing-up 'in the Churchillian fashion' of the message of the whole book.

Chapter 8, the longest in the book, is a study by Father Gibbard of 'The Christian Mystery.'

[1] Mowbray; 12s. 6d. net.

He begins by discussing the word ' mystery ' in a liturgical sense—which takes us a long way from Ephesians; for the cultic sense of the term does not occur till the fourth century. In the Bible itself the word means ' God's purpose for the nations formerly concealed but now manifested through his servant.' This purpose, says the New Testament, is now actualized in the coming of the Kingdom through Christ's death and resurrection and in the Church's identification of itself with Christ its Redeemer. So in Paul's letters the theme of the ' mystery ' is that the long foretold reunion of Jew and Gentile is now being effected and that, even beyond that miracle, a wonderful re-integration of the whole universe, a gathering-up of all things into one in Christ, is being wrought out. So great is this gospel ' mystery ' that all men must have the chance to hear. And Paul's calling (as it is ours to-day) is to enable them to do so.

We have kept the best wine to the last. In our view, E. K. Lee's essay on ' Unity in Israel and Unity in Christ ' is the highlight of the volume and the most timely for to-day. The theme is not simply unity as it appears in Ephesians but also as it had engaged the Jewish people down the ages. The search for unity, says Mr. Lee, is a universal urge and an ancient one. We trace it in the Ionian philosophers, the Pythagoreans, and the Stoics. But alone of all peoples the Jews found it in the oneness of God. Because of that oneness the world is a unity. But this original unity of one God, one world, one people, one language is shattered by man's rebellious pride which causes him to create and worship other gods. Thus arise the divisions of the world and, very specially, the cleavage between Israel and ' the nations,' the Gentiles.

Israel cherishes the hope of a restoration of that lost unity, although it cannot be till the end of time when the Messiah comes. None the less, we may read in the Old Testament the ways in which it will come—through a representative Messiah in whom the people will be one, through a universal Temple to which all men will come for worship, through a sovereign Prince of Peace who will rule the whole earth. But if for Jews all this is merely hope, for Christians it has now, in some measure, come with the Messiah's coming. This is the theme of Ephesians ; the future hope, as it unfolds itself, will enfold all things ; for it is God's purpose in Christ to reunite what is divided, and to sum up all into one.

The Church's sacraments of Baptism and the Lord's Supper are the Divine acts by which union with Christ is accomplished. Clearly much ' growing up ' will be needed before ' the Christ that is to be ' becomes full grown and complete. Nevertheless, Ephesians proclaims that the decisive battle for unity has been fought and won and, as God is God, the final triumph is assured.

What emerges, then, in this essay, is nothing less than the whole ' plan of salvation ' in terms of unity. Our ecumenists have heard its challenge, but have the rest of us given it its proper place in our thinking and preaching ? Salvation is not only justification, reconciliation, life : it is unity. If ever there was a time for such a message, it is now. As we write, the utter broken-ness of the world is tragic to see—disunity within countless psychotic individuals, within countless marriages, within the Church : division between East and West, between Jew and Arab, between Britain and the so-called United Nations. The non-Christian may accept disunity as a regrettable fact of existence ; but for the Christian, who has any glimmering of God's plan for the world as Paul saw it, disunity can never be anything but sin. If we accept disunity and fail in our ministry of reconciliation, we stand condemned. Here is the gravity of our situation ; yet here, too, is the grandeur of what Christ has done, the vocation of His Church in the world, and the God-given hope to which all our prayer should be directed.

No effort to preach the doctrine of providence to-day can afford to neglect the technical developments of modern civilization. Providence is God's way of directing the life of mankind, while technics is man's way of attempting to control the course of his own life. Are these two complementary or contradictory ? Can God's purpose of bringing men into saving fellowship with Himself be realized within the structures and operations that are typical of contemporary society, or are we trespassing on forbidden ground with our technology ? There is an interesting chapter on these and related questions in a recent book which ranges much further afield and endeavours to show that a proper understanding of life to-day leads to the conviction that the world is in God's hand and that He is at work in history.[1]

The story of man's technical progress is a long one and until about a century and a half ago it was a slow and gradual one. Since then there

[1] *God's Way with Man*, by Professor Roger Hazelton, B.D., Ph.D. (Abingdon Press ; $3.00).

has been an astounding acceleration and the danger seems imminent that man should be remade by the very things he makes. Some words of an Old Testament writer about graven images are all too apt to describe our technically dominated society—'Those who make them are like them; so are all who trust in them' (Ps 115[8] [R.S.V.]). Yet it is futile to denounce technology and seek to revert to the primitive. To make the machine the villain of the piece is a panic reaction which serves to conceal the deeper truth that it is man himself, not his mechanical contrivances, that is the root of our difficulties. Technics began as the extending and refining of human capacities—the lever a stronger arm and the telescope a keener eye. There is nothing objectionable in that. Trouble begins when man gives way to idolatrous technical pride and uses his technics to exalt himself. A tool is only as good or bad as its maker and user, and the problem of technics is just the problem of man himself. The Christian thinker, therefore, instead of setting up an essential antithesis between men and the machine, will wish to raise the deeper question about man. Who does he think he is? Who, in fact, is he?

Scripture has an answer to that question. It is significant that in the Genesis story of creation the command to 'replenish the earth and subdue it' follows directly upon God's saying 'Let us make man in our image.' Man's dominion over the creation springs from the fact that he is created like God. The realm of technics belongs to man as made in the image of God, for God, intending to share His own lordship with man, imparts to man something of His own initiative, wisdom and strength. In the Scriptural phrase God crowns man with glory and honour and puts all things under his feet. The making of man consists in the self-giving of God, and thus we come to have a creaturely creativeness and to function as God's deputies in the finite natural order.

The Christian approach to technology, therefore, can never be entirely negative; but two fundamental principles must be held in their relatedness and not separately. First, power over Nature is legitimately man's. Technics is anchored solidly in man's likeness to God bestowed on him at his very creation. Second, however, power over man is decidedly God's. When man attempts to usurp that power he sins and so distorts and destroys himself, for Nature reacts upon him. Technics, it must be stressed, cannot be held identical with sin; and yet in modern civilization sin tends to take a technological form, since that is the form in which our living has to be done.

In this connexion Dr. HAZELTON points out that the common lament that man is able to control everything but himself smacks of Stoicism rather than Christianity. It is the former which makes a prime virtue of self-mastery. The demand that human nature should be brought more and more under scientific and technical control reveals a neo-stoic tendency. A Christian on the other hand knows that mastery over human nature is not to be approached as an engineering job but as a venture of faith, which comes by way of acknowledging God's lordship over all man's existence. Without seeming ungrateful to modern science and technology one must question their right to make man conform to the forces they have let loose. If they are to condition man, who is to condition them? It must be those who know what God's image means in a technological age. It means that to be placed above Nature is also to be placed under God; and thus both man and Nature can only function aright and serve God's purpose in creating them in so far as man remains open upward to God.

In making man in His own image God took the risks of giving man freedom, but, contrary to much contemporary opinion, technics does not supplant but rather demands the constant exercise of freedom. Man is not meant to be, nor is he made to be, at the mercy of his tools. He is to retain command of them through his God-given freedom; and that freedom consists in being second in command to his own Maker, Sustainer and Redeemer. Providence may well appear malevolent if we take it into our own hands and play at being God; but the release of atomic energy, which may spell annihilation, may also spell wonderful advantage, if we will be rightly warned and recalled to the basic Scriptural truth that man is the intended master of things, but only because God is the indubitable master of men.

By placing upon human beings the burden of responsibility for its development, the realm of technics releases and requires the full degree of their freedom. The more man takes the control of life into his own hands the more becomes his actual dependence—though not, alas, his conscious reliance—upon God's ultimate control. If we will hear God's call not to be conformed to this world we shall prove that which is His good and acceptable and perfect will for us. We need not then scare ourselves with that which is only the work of our own hands, but may take the world of technics as a sign of God's sovereign care for man, a token of God's unfailing, self-imparting fatherhood and lordship.

Expository Problems

Ephesians vi. 12—Evil Powers

By the Reverend D. E. H. Whiteley, M.A., Jesus College, Oxford

'For our wrestling is not against flesh and blood, but against the principalities, against the powers, against the world-rulers of this darkness, against the spiritual *hosts* of wickedness in the heavenly *places*.'

The kernel of the New Testament teaching concerning Evil Powers is that Christ is their conqueror, and that those who belong to Christ are enabled to share in His victory. Belief in Evil Powers plays a small part in the Old Testament,[1] where it mainly takes the form of vestigial survivals,[2] and in the Mishna, but it looms large in the New Testament,[3] and in later Judaism.[4] However, what especially distinguishes the New Testament is not the belief in Evil Powers, which it shares with many systems of religious thought besides later Judaism, but its insistence upon the victory of Christ.

No one ought to quarrel with Cullmann's [5] contention that the New Testament's teaching on this subject must never be regarded as peripheral or secondary. But it is essential to distinguish between what the New Testament says and the manner in which it is expressed. The New Testament proclaims the fact that Christ offers us salvation from sin and from death; it also presupposes a theory concerning the origin of sin and death, namely the theory that they are due to the transgression of our first parents recorded in Gn 3. All men alike, whether secular humanists or practising Christians, are compelled by the facts to admit the reality of sin and death; the Christian is marked out from all others by his belief in Christ's victory over sin and death: but no Christian need feel himself bound either to believe or to disbelieve in the theory of the origin of sin and death which is associated with the literal interpretation of Gn 3. In the same way, no one can fail to recognize the actuality of what contemporary theologians term 'the demonic,' that is, of vitality acting chaotically and destructively [6]: but it is not necessary to accept the view that this 'living element in experience' [7] is caused by personal or sub-personal entities. As Dr. H. H. Farmer reminds us, there is 'nothing essentially religious in the belief in the *demons, devils or evil spirits*.' [8] On the other hand, a dogmatic denial of their existence is not justified: Karl Jaspers goes too far when he says: 'It is an illusion to treat demons as realities, to accept them as facts, to "reckon with them." There are no demons.' [9] It is essential to distinguish, as Professor G. H. C. Macgregor [10] has recently reminded us, between the demonic forces mentioned in Ephesians and the devils which Christ cast out during the course of His earthly ministry. Dr. Leslie Weatherhead [11] argues, soberly and cogently, for the objective existence of devils in the latter sense. Fr. Victor White, O.P.,[12] suggests that the same phenomena would appear to be described by psychologists in terms of 'autonomous complexes,' etc., and by theologians in terms of diabolic possession. It is illegitimate to disregard the possibility that what psychologists *describe* in terms of complexes may, at least in some cases, be *caused* by evil spirits. This, however, is an open question; Fr. White is too careful to claim that his suggestion is an established fact. It would be less easy to argue that the Evil Powers of Ephesians have an objective existence. In the remainder of this article such terms as 'demonic' will be employed in a purely descriptive sense: the speculative problem of the ontological status of Evil Powers and of the aetiology of demonic phenomena will be left unsolved.

We are warned, in the first place, that our struggle is against demonic powers and not against flesh and blood, that is to say, not against human beings.[13] Realization of this fact can save us both

[1] F. Prat, S.J., *La Théologie de Saint Paul* [38] [1949], vol. ii. note P, pp. 492–502.

[2] W. O. E. Oesterley, *Immortality and the Unseen World* [1921], ch. 4.

[3] E. Stauffer, *New Testament Theology*, tr. J. Marsh [1955], 64 ff.

[4] J. Bonsirven, S.J., *Le Judaisme Palestinien au Temps de Jésus-Christ* [2] [1935], 240 ff.

[5] *Christ et le Temps* [1947], 138.

[6] A. D. Galloway, *The Cosmic Christ* [1951], 25 f.

[7] *Ib.*, 230.

[8] *Revelation and Religion* [1954], 90.

[9] *The Perennial Scope of Philosophy* [1950], 119.

[10] 'Principalities and Powers' in *New Testament Studies*, I. i. [September, 1954], 19.

[11] *Psychology, Religion and Healing* [2] [1952], 96–108.

[12] *God and the Unconscious* [1952], 188.

[13] Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar zum Neuen Testament aus Talmud und Midrasch*, i. [1922], 730.

from undue optimism and from unjustified recrimination. Before the Second World War it was true to say that the majority of human beings, both in England and in Germany, desired peace; but the event showed that it was dangerous to argue from this fact that war would not break out. Both countries were impelled, although not deterministically, by demonic forces, that is to say, by powerful, vital forces outside the control of individuals. A secular historian would be unlikely to use the term 'demonic': he would speak rather of group loyalties or of historical and economic factors. But whatever language we may choose to employ, the facts remain: individual goodwill, though valuable, and indeed indispensable, is not enough. The recognition of the demonic element is a safeguard against excessively bitter judgments. There is nothing specifically Christian in this realization. The 'rootless, depersonalized individual' of our days is only too ready to say that we are 'in the grip of circumstances': 'circumstances' constitute the counterpart in secular thought to original sin and to demonic forces in traditional Christianity. At the moralistic level we must say that man is not determined by external factors, whether described as 'circumstances' or as 'demonic forces,' since it is because of our own weakness, for which in part we are personally responsible, that they have power against us. We do not reach the Christian level until we go on to say that it is possible for us to share in Christ's victory over the Evil Powers.

Another consequence of the fact that our struggle is against demonic forces has been lucidly expounded by Emil Brunner: 'In contrast to the Greek conception of sin, namely, that sin is due to man's sense-nature and thus the body is regarded as the source of evil, the Christian Faith regards sin mainly as pride and rebellion.'[1] It is obviously wrong to limit sin to such 'conventional' faults as fornication and drunkenness.[2] But at this point we must be on our guard against a possible danger of over-simplification. It is incorrect and indeed positively harmful to say 'the besetting sin of this age is so and so.' 'This age' is a piece of verbal shorthand which refers to different groups of people who all live at the same time. It is perfectly true that one of these groups, namely the group which consists of practising Christians, the 'inner circle,' is more prone to the sins of pride and complacency than to physical cruelty or sexual promiscuity. But there are others whose chief temptations lie precisely in these latter spheres. The sins of the flesh are not the only or the most subtle forms of sin, but they are exceedingly sinful and rampant.[3]

For purposes of exegesis it is unnecessary to subject the words 'principality,' 'power,' etc., to analysis or to trace parallels in Hellenistic[4] and Gnostic[5] thought or in post-Biblical Judaism[6]; for example, the fact that 'world-ruler' (*κοσμοκράτωρ*) is found in Rabbinic sources under the transliterated form קוסמוקרטור[7] does not aid our understanding of the passage. As R. Leivestad remarks: 'The different entities lack individual character. The whole enumeration is meant to produce a rhetorical mass-effect, to call forth an atmosphere of horror, danger and war.'[8] We may paraphrase the verse 'We must fight not only against human beings, but against "the demonic".' It remains to consider contemporary applications of the demonic, which correspond in our own situation to the oppositions against which the readers of Ephesians were warned.

> And to be wroth with one we love
> Doth work like madness in the brain.

These familiar lines draw our attention to an important aspect of the demonic. If we are on bad terms with a person whose connexion with us is remote, we are not greatly affected. But when even a trivial misunderstanding arises between those who are held tightly together by the bonds of natural affection or of some common loyalty, the bitterness of the misunderstanding is increased by the closeness of the relationship. A quarrel with a casual acquaintance causes no great emotional strain, but a quarrel over a similar cause with a marriage partner or with a son or daughter may be devastating in its effects. It is as if husband and wife, for example, were held together by a powerful gravitational force, or perhaps it would be better to say by a force analogous to that which holds in equilibrium the component parts of the nucleus of an atom. When that equilibrium is destroyed, powerful forces are released, which may be exceedingly destructive. Illustrations drawn from the physical sciences are inevitably misleading when applied in the sphere of personal relationships, but it is beyond dispute that if the harmony of a close relationship is disturbed, and the estrangement goes beyond a certain critical point, then the force which previously bound two human beings together becomes disruptive and destructive. This fact

[1] *The Christian Doctrine of Creation and Redemption*, tr. O. Wyon [1952], 139.

[2] *I.e.*, those faults which the man in the street regards as sinful.

[3] Cf. Gal 5^{16-21}.

[4] Cf. W. Michaelis, in *T.W.N.T.*, iii. 913.

[5] Cf. R. Bultmann, *Theology of the New Testament*, i., tr. K. Grobel [1952], 164–183, especially p. 173.

[6] Cf. J. Bonsirven, *op. cit.*

[7] Strack-Billerbek, *op. cit.*, ii. 552.

[8] *Christ the Conqueror* [1954], 161.

HOLBROOK LIBRARY PACIFIC SCHOOL

applies both in the family and in any other grouping of men who are held together by a deep loyalty. To a situation in which emotions normally cohesive become destructive and derisive, the term ' demonic ' may fairly be applied.

Nothing that may be said here about the demonic is intended to be more than a footnote to Tillich's classical treatment of the subject in *The Interpretation of History*.[1] He there characterizes as ' Demonries of the Present ' nationalism and the autonomy of the economic, to which Brunner [2] has already drawn our attention. Among the manifestations of the demonic which have become more noticeable, at least in Great Britain, since the close of the Second World War is perseveration, the survival of attitudes which are now positively harmful, although we can readily understand how they arose under the different conditions which obtained in the past. It is easy to deplore the attitude of those who have raised difficulties concerning the boring of holes in cases where both wood and metal were involved. But we shall be guilty of a gross injustice if we lay the blame wholly upon their shoulders. In part at least they were the victims of past circumstances, of demonic forces. Their attitude was inherited from the past, from an earlier period when employment was hard to find. It should be unnecessary to add that the operation of ' demonic forces ' is to be found on both sides of industry ; ' management ' as well as ' labour ' sometimes fails to adapt itself to changing conditions : and if we attempt to apportion all the blame to one side or the other, we have ourselves become the victims of a demonic temptation. If we realize the power of attitudes based upon past conditions we shall not blame too bitterly those whose actions they have influenced. We shall also be duly thankful when these forces are partially overcome. For example, we ought not to take for granted the relative rapidity with which so many Americans have risen above their traditional isolationism or the mental flexibility of the Trade Union leaders in our own country who have adapted themselves to changing circumstances and have realized the fact that their Unions can now play a part in the life of the nation which differs in some vital respects from the function which they had to perform before the Second World War.

Industrial tension is heightened by another factor which is potentially demonic, namely group loyalty. This powerful and frequently beneficial force becomes destructive when it ceases to be subordinate to a higher loyalty. Reinhold Niebuhr expresses the point in these words : ' The possession of the self by something less than the " Holy Spirit " means that it is possible for the self to be partly fulfilled and partly destroyed by its submission to a power and spirit which is greater than the self in its empiric reality, but not great enough to do justice to the self in its ultimate freedom. Such spirit can be most simply defined as demonic.'[3] Many writers have recognized the demonic aspect of the older type of nationalism, of capitalism and of colonialism, and to recognize their demonic aspect is to realize their vitality and power. It is also clear that these forces have been powerful for good, and that they have been demonic only when they have failed to observe a true proportion. But realization of the demonic element in these older forces, which were mainly associated with privileged groups, must not blind our eyes to the potentially demonic element which is inherent in the natural efforts of those previously underprivileged to win for themselves the benefits which they have not yet obtained. The demonic pervades all human life which is vital and strong, and we must not identify it exclusively with either side in a conflict. Imperialism had its demonic side as well as its good side, and the same applies to the world-wide self-liberation movement of the coloured peoples which is vital and powerful and therefore becomes demonic when it fails to observe its proper limits. If we are aware of the potentially demonic force of this movement, we cannot fail to be grateful for the comparative paucity of bitterness displayed by Indians towards Great Britain.

Many of the demonic phenomena of our day are to be associated with advances in technology which frequently lead to a rise in the standard of living. In Africa the rapid industrialization of the Copper Belt has sucked the men into the mining areas and shattered the pattern of life in the villages which have largely been left to the women, the aged and the infirm. Yet this movement is vital and powerful and is a condition of economic growth. In our own country the slums are being abolished, which is unquestionably an improvement ; but in their place we have housing estates, unbalanced communities, or rather conglomerations composed almost entirely of young adults and small children. All over the world the ' problem of youth ' has reached terrible proportions. There is no youth problem in a stable society where each generation grows up under the same conditions as the generation before. But where conditions change with great rapidity, the outlook of the children may differ from that of their parents to a dangerous degree. Margaret Mead has pointed out that in the U.S.A. ' the rapid rate of inventions and change has also made each generation of children relatively more proficient than their parents ' [4] ; this naturally has the effect of decreasing respect for parents

[1] [1936], 77 ff.

[2] *The Divine Imperative*, tr. O. Wyon [1937], 392.

[3] *The Nature and Destiny of Man*, ii. [1943], 114–115.

[4] *Growing up in New Guinea* [Pelican Books, 1954], 163.

and of making the children regard themselves as a race apart—and generally as a superior race! It is to be anticipated that within the next century this problem will become acute in India and in the other developing countries where technological advances are to be expected. All these tensions are potentially demonic, since vital forces are liable to conflict, to exceed their proper bounds and to become destructive. Christianity, at least in the West, is associated with the *status quo*, and therefore lies open to a demonic temptation to look upon change as such with a jaundiced eye. Change, however, is part of the 'given' which we must accept as we accept the physical world; some measure of tension is likewise inevitable. Tillich reminds us that 'the claim of anything finite to be final in its own right is demonic.'[1] We shall fall victims to the demonic if we turn the Church into a society for the preservation of Christianity *in its present form and in its present setting*.

That such difficulties and tensions occur in the contemporary situation is, of course, a commonplace; and it may be objected that to apply to them the 'mythological' term 'demonic' is a piece of pointless mystification. The purpose of such a procedure is to express our present troubles in the language of the New Testament in order to see the bearing of the New Testament message upon the problem of our own life. In Ephesians we are told that we can overcome them if we put on the panoply of God. In this promise there is an undoubted reference to the future contained in the words: 'that ye may be able to withstand in the evil day.' This verse inevitably raises a question. Will there be a final conflict, a growing opposition between good and evil culminating in some kind of Armageddon? At this point we shall do well to remember the words of Reinhold Niebuhr: 'The symbol of the second coming of Christ can neither be taken literally nor dismissed as unimportant.'[2] It must not be dismissed as unimportant, because the New Testament is dominated by it, and expresses by means of it the Christian belief that God will finally fulfil His purpose for the world. That He will do so literally, precisely as described in 1 Th 4, is a possibility which we cannot exclude, but it is wrong to identify belief in God's victory with a theory about how that victory is to be achieved. An earlier generation, or to be more exact, some members of it, identified their correct belief in God's victory with a theory of the inevitability of moral and social progress in this world. It is equally wrong to identify it with a theory of the inevitability of recurring crises; the Christian hope must not be confused with any forecast concerning the future of mankind upon this planet, whether optimistic or pessimistic. Only one thing is inevitable, the victory of God.

The full significance of this chapter eludes us until we remember its background in the Old Testament. It clearly recalls the language of Is 59^{17} and Wis 5^{17} where similar phrases are used to describe the armour which God Himself wears: because we are members of Christ the power of God is made available to us for the fulfilment of His purpose, and because His purpose includes the overthrow of the Evil Powers, they will finally be defeated.

The implications of this fact are clear: because Christ is One with God, and because we are members of Christ, the whole power of God is behind us in our struggle with the Evil Powers. This does not mean that if we are Christians we can disregard technical problems, since the God of Redemption is also the God of Creation. A surgeon cannot presume to be professionally incompetent merely because he is a Christian. In the same way, for example, a Personnel Manager who is a Christian must pay due regard to the problems of piece rates and wage differentials. But mere technical competence is not enough. We must put on the whole armour of God, our Creator and Redeemer, if we are to share in His victory over the Evil Powers.

[1] *Systematic Theology*, i. [1953], 149.
[2] *Op. cit.*, 299.

Literature

APPROACH TO THEOLOGY

Under the title *Natural Religion and Christian Theology* (Nisbet; 14s. net) the President of Cheshunt College, Cambridge, Professor A. Victor Murray, presents in book form the Cole Lectures which he delivered in 1955 at Vanderbilt University, U.S.A. The six chapters are described by the author as 'An Introductory Study' to what he regards as the most suitable 'first approach' to Christian theology. Neither philosophy nor history supplies this. The two sciences of psychology and anthropology give a more profitable approach. They help us to begin with ourselves, with man where and as he is, and they give us firm ground upon which to go. According to these sciences the most characteristic thing about man is that he is 'a worshipping animal,' that universally there is awareness of and response to a Supreme Being, and that this knowledge, this experience of God, is

mediated to man through Nature, morality, and the personal encounters in living. We are justified in speaking of natural religion in as much as no form of religious culture is without the touch of God; and as there is no knowledge, however primitive, which does not include the element of interpretation we can speak of natural theology, or at least of 'the raw material' of theology. The real distinction this approach helps us to draw is not between natural religion and revealed religion but between natural religion and historical religion. What then of this approach as directed upon the significance of Christianity? It will help us to understand better both the formation and the meaning of the concepts used in Christian utterances; also it will prevent us from a theological exclusiveness which puts the Christian faith in stark contrast to every other form of religious thought or life. This latter point is a main emphasis for the writer, expressively announced in his sentence, '*Eros* has a divine side to it and *Agape* has also a human side to it and it does not do to treat these two as mutually exclusive.'

The author asks his readers to underline the word 'approach,' and rightly so, for there is only one chapter, the concluding one, which deals directly and to some length with the substance of the Christian faith. Professor Murray presents in his book to a very large degree the liberal approach familiar to us in theology fifty or sixty years ago. Readers who may agree that Liberalism has still a corrective work to do in relation, say, to extreme Barthianism will likely wonder why an almost peevish impatience with all traditional ways of theology so often occurs in these pages. 'We know that theologians have a gentle habit of playing by themselves in a walled garden shut off from public view and using a language nobody else understands.' But there is hardly any notice by the author of contemporary theologians who without abandoning the liberal inheritance have passed that inheritance through the fires of criticism, and at the same time have utilized at real depth the bearing of the newer sciences of human nature upon their exposition of the Christian witness. Neglect of this appears to the reviewer to make Professor Murray's interpretation of the 'finality' of Christianity in his concluding chapter humanist rather than evangelical. Though this brightly written book has a heap of interesting stuff in it, it does not go far, and it does not go deep, for theological purposes of a primary order.

J. MACLEOD

THE ALCOHOLIC

Understanding and Counseling the Alcoholic through Religion and Psychology, by the Rev. Howard J. Clinebell, Jr. (Abingdon Press; $3.75), is one of the most exhaustive books on the understanding, the approach to, and the treatment of the alcoholic I have come across. By his academic training and his pastoral experience of the victims of drink Dr. Clinebell is well qualified to give guidance on this most difficult problem.

In the first section we have a definition of the alcoholic more from the point of view of the effects of alcoholism on 'the life adjustments and disturbance of interpersonal relations': he cannot hold his job, his home is broken up, and he steadily slides down the social scale until he reaches bottom. Each type is well illustrated from the author's contacts with alcoholics. The chapter dealing with causes goes into the various theories—physiological, moral, neurotic. From statistics we gather that six per cent. of those who drink alcohol as a beverage are liable to become addicts. Why not the other ninety-four per cent.? The author believes that alcohol is not a habit-forming drug like morphia; it is a disease. We must look within people for the causes, not in the stuff itself. *Alcoholism comes in people not in bottles.* There is a penetrating study of the three types of anxiety involved in the etiology of alcoholism—*neurotic, historical and existential.*

Part two deals with the various approaches to the alcoholic, but especially the religious; because religion is the one sure solution; it alone can satisfy what alcohol satisfies in the alcoholic. There is a valuable psychological analysis of the approach of the Rescue Missions. These treat the victim as a sinner needing a Saviour and recognize no compulsion that needs first to be understood. Readers will remember William James' account of the Jerry Macauley Mission. These Missions' 'conception of alcoholism and homelessness is grossly inadequate, overlooking nearly all that the social sciences have to tell about these two phenomena.' The approach of the Salvation Army is praised in spite of limitations which prevent it from being more effective. The effect of religion plus psychotherapy is well illustrated by an account of the now defunct Emmanuel Movement which pioneered the co-operation between medicine and religion. No praise is too extravagant for the work of *Alcoholics Anonymous*. So far they have more successes than any other approach. They stress the utter inability of the victim to break the power of the craving; he needs God and the help of those who have been where he is now.

The final section gives the minister, the social worker, the doctor and the psychiatrist true insight into both the ethical problem and treatment through counselling. The chapter on Prevention and the detection of early symptoms of addiction will be very valuable to all who seek to help some

of the most unfortunate people in society. For those interested in alcoholism as a social problem, or in the etiology and treatment of the trouble I can recommend the book. Every public library should have it on its shelves ; and no student of pastoral psychology should be without it.

JOHN G. MCKENZIE

CALVIN

Since it first appeared in 1938, Professor Wilhelm Niesel's study of Calvin's theology has been acknowledged by specialists as a standard work on the subject, but hitherto it has been accessible only in German. Now the book has appeared in English as *The Theology of Calvin* (Lutterworth Press ; 27s. 6d. net), newly revised by the author and ably translated by Dr. Harold Knight.

This is a welcome addition to our theological literature. It is true that several studies of Calvin have appeared in English in the past few years, but these have been devoted to particular aspects of his teaching—for instance, his doctrines of man, of the sacraments, of the last things, to mention three. There was great need for a comprehensive up-to-date survey of Calvin, for only in the light of his whole theology can his treatment of particular doctrines be properly understood. The need is adequately met by the work under review.

It would be quite wrong to suppose that Professor Niesel simply compresses into one volume a convenient summary of what is to be found in more detail in separate monographs. The aim of a comprehensive study is quite different from that. It is to explore the fundamental question of how Calvin conceived the task of Christian theology, and to lay bare the unifying principle which guided his treatment of all the ramifications of the subject.

In the past, several suggestions have been made about the unifying principle in Calvin's thought. Some have claimed to find it in the idea of the sovereignty of God, others in the doctrine of predestination. Faced with the conflict of opinions, a few have concluded that there is no unifying principle at all. Professor Niesel's assertion is more far-reaching than any of these. He claims that the unifying principle in Calvin's theology is its steady orientation to the incarnate Word. ' The argument of Calvin is Christo-centric.' It is revelational theology in the strictest sense, everything depending on God's self-disclosure in Jesus Christ.

This is the central thesis of the book, and it is impressively supported by a fully documented survey of Calvin's theology, designed to show that in every aspect of his teaching his thought is directed to ' the God revealed in flesh.' Professor Niesel is content to expound Calvin's theology—largely in Calvin's own words—and scarcely ever does he make a critical comment of his own. When such comment is made, it must therefore be regarded as significant. Thus it is to be noted that in dealing with the doctrine of election Professor Niesel, though claiming that here also the orientation of Calvin's thought is towards the incarnate Word, feels constrained to add : ' It must be admitted that the Reformer has not always consistently maintained this direction of his thoughts, especially in his polemical writings about predestination.'

Towards the end of the book we come upon this statement : ' We do not wish to deny that Calvin has moulded his doctrine by the help of those resources which history and his own disposition suggested.' But if historical and personal influences enter into the texture of his theology, can it still be maintained that it is based on nothing but the revelation in Jesus Christ ? Even if his theology is purely revelational in its intention, have these extra-revelational factors nowhere influenced or even distorted its results ? Unfortunately Professor Niesel does not discuss all the implications of his own statement here.

Whether or not the reader goes all the way with Professor Niesel in his admiration for Calvin, he will at least be left ' without excuse,' so to speak, for harbouring any misunderstandings or superficial prejudices about Calvin's teaching. The value of the work lies in its exposition. The author has made himself complete master of the vast literature of his subject, and has set out Calvin's thought fully, systematically, and with authority. A book of this kind is virtually indispensable, for no student of theology can afford to neglect Calvin, and no one who wishes to understand Calvin will do without the help of Professor Niesel's scholarly work.

JOHN MACQUARRIE

TWO MORE BIBLE STUDIES

Some months ago we welcomed Dr William Barclay's Study Notes on Acts and Mark, and noted with pleasure the author's intention to provide similar Notes on the other books of the New Testament. Already two more have been published by the Saint Andrew Press. One is on *The Gospel of Luke* and the other on *The Letters to the Corinthians*. Each one costs 12s. 6d. net, but is available in paper covers at 6s. net.

As in the earlier books, we are deeply impressed by the abundance and the aptness of the illustrations and quotations. Without doubt individual readers in their periods of private devotion or Bible study will find much here for their good, but one has the impression that increasingly Dr. Barclay has in mind, not so much the individual Christian

disciple, as the leader of a group or the preacher who wishes to give systematic and consecutive instruction on the message of the Bible text. Such servants of the Church will find here not only the material for expository preaching and teaching, but they will find it set out in such orderly arrangement that their own task of presentation will be greatly eased.

Perhaps one (abbreviated) illustration may be given of Dr. Barclay's method. It is the exposition of the meaning of the Ascension in Lk 24^{50-53}: 'To the disciples the Ascension was three things: (i) It was an ending. One stage was past, and another had to begin. . . . (ii) But equally it was a beginning. The disciples did not leave the scene heartbroken; they left it with great joy. . . . (iii) Further, the Ascension gave the disciples the certainty that they had a friend not only on earth but in heaven. . . . To die is not to go out into the dark; it is to go to Him.' Orderly presentations such as this, simple and yet rich in devotional insight, abound in both these books.

The emphasis on positive exposition does not, however, lead to an avoidance of exegetical difficulties. The problem passage in 1 Co 7^{36-38} is tackled resolutely, and so is the difficulty of the sequence of thought between 1 Co 9^{1} and the preceding verses.

One may perhaps ask whether, in the exposition of the Parable of Dives and Lazarus (Lk 16^{19-21}), too much is made of the early details of the story, and too little of the concluding sentence (*v.* 31), in which surely the real significance of the parable lies. Is there a danger that the expositor may sometimes allow himself to look for preaching points rather than the less preachable truth which the passage is really seeking to express?

Where, however, there is such a rich store of good things, such a question seems rather finicking. Certainly it is with the utmost cordiality we commend these books, as we commended the earlier ones, especially to those who wish to understand the words of the New Testament in such a way as to be able to expound them for the enlightenment and the comfort of others. C. L. Mitton

---

FOUNDERS OF THREE RELIGIONS

In 1890 Dr. Marcus Dods published four lectures with the title 'Mohammed, Buddha, and Christ,' in which he discussed Islam and Buddhism (although he raised the question as to whether Buddhism is a religion), and then argued that Christianity is both absolutely and relatively the best religion. Dr. F. H. Hilliard has just published a book of a very different nature on the same three religions in the series of 'Ethical and Religious Classics of East and West'—*The Buddha, the Prophet, and the Christ* (Allen and Unwin; 12s. 6d. net). He deals with the Founders and not with the religions themselves, giving selected passages from the scriptures of the three religions 'which reflect the belief that the Founder of the religion was not simply a human being but was possessed of supernatural qualities and characteristics.' In each instance the sources are first described. Attention may here be drawn to a strange form of wording regarding the six books of tradition accepted as authoritative by Sunni Muslims. He says that 'for something like the first three centuries of Islamic history [they] were so accepted by the whole of the Muslim world.' All the compilers lived and worked in the third century, but their works were only gradually accepted as authoritative. Indeed, many centuries passed before Ibn Mājah's collection was generally accepted.

Passages are quoted relating to such subjects as the pre-existence, birth, call, ministry and death of the Founders, the supernatural character of the Buddha, and the Buddhology of the Mahāyāna, the heavenly intercession of Muhammad, and the apotheosis of the Prophet, the resurrection and ascension of the Christ, and the Christology of the New Testament. While appropriate passages are quoted, the book is not simply a collection of translations, but is interspersed with connecting and explanatory notes which are very illuminating. In a valuable concluding chapter the author reviews the material collected. He holds that 'both in Buddhism and in Christianity the way was found to express the idea of the fundamental oneness of the Founder with ultimate reality,' but points out that while in Islam a similar process of thought is seen at work, the full association does not seem to have taken place. He suggests that a purely human interpretation of the person of the Founder could not satisfy any of the main stages of religious thought in the three religions, but one feels that this is hardly quite fair to Islam. There are many traditions which suggest that the Prophet had supernatural powers, but the Koran goes out of its way to insist that he was human.

This is an excellent book which displays fine scholarship. While passages are quoted illustrating the high position attributed to the Founder in the three religions, the author does not press suggestions of similarity but shows true scholarly caution in dealing with his material. When he discusses the possibility of borrowing ideas he is careful not to assume borrowing simply because similar ideas occur. Although some aspects of Muslim theology owe something to Christian influence, he wisely notes that 'Islamic beliefs form a corpus expressive of the whole spirit of Islam and are not simply a loose admixture of Arabian, Jewish and Christian ideas.' James Robson

WORLD CHRISTIAN BOOKS

Two very useful volumes have emerged in the 'World Christian Books' series. *Jesus and His People*, by the Rev. Paul S. Minear (Lutterworth Press; 2s. 6d. net), is a book on the Church. It studies the Church under certain great headings and titles—God's People, Called by My Name, The New and the Living Way, My Mother and My Brothers, God's Temple, One Flock, One Shepherd, Elect Exiles of the Dispersion, The One New Man. It has a further appendix in which twenty-four more word pictures of the relationship of the Christian to Christ are set out, with the scriptural references. The uniqueness of the people of God lies in these things: 'Its uniqueness lies in its owner, its ruler, its king. Only He can say of it, "*My* people." Its uniqueness lies also in its origin —God's gracious calling expressed in the forgiveness of sins. Its uniqueness lies in its mission—to proclaim the eternal gospel to all nations and tribes and tongues and peoples. Its uniqueness lies in its destiny—to be fulfilled when the knowledge of God covers the earth as the waters cover the sea.' This is a very helpful book, which sets before the reader the ideal of the Church in the most winsome way.

The companion volume, *Did Jesus Rise from the Dead?*, by the Rev. James Martin (2s. 6d. net), is even better adapted for the purpose of this series. It has real scholarship, lucid arrangement of its material, and simple, yet cogent, expression. It has an excellent chapter on the documents themselves, wherein the process by which the New Testament books came into being is set out, and their historicity vindicated, all in ten pages—an achievement of lucid compression. It has a very honest chapter on the difficulties and discrepancies in the various Resurrection narratives, and a chapter in which the theories which have been put forward to explain the empty tomb, apart from the Resurrection, are subjected to an able and effective criticism. It attempts the task of saying something about the nature of Christ's Resurrection Body with as much success as any one could. It has a good chapter on the Testimony of the Church's Beginning. There it poses certain questions which can only be answered in the light of the Resurrection—(1) What else can explain the transformation of the disciples? (2) What else can explain the birth of the Church? (3) What else can explain the survival and growth of the Church? (4) What else can explain the observance of the First Day of the Week? (5) What else can explain the conversion of the priests? (6) What else can explain the conversion of Saul? (7) What else can explain the belief in Jesus' deity?

This is a book well calculated to strengthen the belief of the believer and to challenge the negations of the sceptic and to solve the uncertainties of the doubter. We think that this is Mr. Martin's first published work; if he can maintain this standard, we hope that it will be the first of many.

WILLIAM BARCLAY

It is appropriate that the first A. S. Peake Memorial Lecture should have been delivered by Principal Norman H. Snaith. Dr. Snaith has made a fitting choice of his subject in selecting *The Inspiration and Authority of the Bible* (Epworth Press; 3s. 6d. net), which was the theme of Dr. Peake's two important works—'The Bible: Its Origin, Its Significance, and Its Abiding Worth' and 'The Nature of Scripture.' Dr. Snaith reminds us that A. S. Peake was a great Biblical scholar, and claims that 'there was no greater scholar in his generation.' 'No man could doubt his sincerity and his devotion to the Lord Jesus Christ,' he says, 'with the result that many were prepared to trust him where they could not understand.'

Dr. Snaith's main attention is given to the Old Testament. The New Testament is treated sparingly. But in both cases, following Luther, Dr. Snaith finds the key to these writings, and ultimately their authority, in their fidelity to the idea of God as Saviour. 'The work of God the Saviour,' he writes, 'runs through the whole; the Bible is all concerned with what God has done.' Here is the 'golden thread' in the fabric of Scripture; its uniqueness is not in literary style, in its myths and legends, and its early laws. The pamphlet of thirty-eight pages is all too brief, and we should like to have seen the final page of conclusions greatly expanded. But all in all it is an attractive discussion, marked by the stamp which Dr. Snaith puts upon all he writes.

The Three Hermits, by Mr. J. Baird Ewens (Epworth Press; 12s. 6d. net), is a book about which our only complaint is that the title gives a misleading impression of the contents. Its theme is the relationship between John Wesley and the Tractarians, and the three hermits are Alexander Knox, John Jebb and John Henry Newman. This is an interesting study which casts light on the background and personnel of the Oxford Movement. There is a bibliography but no index.

We are glad to commend a book of popular apologetic addresses—*The Blessing of Belief*, by the Rev. Gordon Powell (Hodder and Stoughton; 7s 6d. net). The author is a Presbyterian minister in Sydney who is believed to have the largest midweek congregation in the world. In response to a young man's appeal for enlightenment he gave

these addresses and was astonished by the widespread response. This is a book to put into the hands of young people unsettled in the faith. Many readers will be specially grateful for the last chapter which deals with spiritual healing and includes an account of the author's own experience of recovery from a disabling condition.

Books on the Christian attitude to questions of conduct are many, and all too few of them give the impression of real competence on the part of their authors. One of these few is *The Law of Christ*, by the Rev. William Lillie, D.D. (Hodder and Stoughton; 7s. 6d. and 4s. 6d. net). The author, who is Lecturer in Biblical Study at the University of Aberdeen, discusses the Christian ethic and such problems as war, race-relations, marriage and divorce, temperance, gambling, Sunday observance, and the challenge of Communism. He is more intent on opening up these questions than on reaching a pre-determined conclusion. This is a really helpful book which will serve for individual or group study. Ministers will find guidance here for the ethical aspect of their preaching.

The Iona Community has published at 7s. 6d. a book by the Deputy Leader of the Community, the Rev. T. Ralph Morton, about the training of the twelve disciples, entitled *The Twelve Together*. The author's point of view is that in any study of the disciples we must see them as a body and not merely as individuals, and that their experience had a determining effect on the writing of the Gospels. The outcome is an original and stimulating study of the Gospels, issuing in suggestions which have relevance for our own day. Mr. Morton is master of the fresh and memorable saying—'It is not our doctrine or our institutions or observances that are built on the foundation of the apostles; but we ourselves.' 'The Church is not so much the company of the saved as the company of the Saviour.' 'When our duties become our joys, then we know that we know the secret of the Kingdom.' We have noted misprints on pp. 68, 77, 120 and 121.

We know of no better attempt to answer the deeper questions asked by young people than *Man and His Society*, by the Rev. Norman J. Bull, M.A. (Religious Education Press; 7s. 6d. net). The author, who is Chaplain and Lecturer in Religious Education at St. Luke's College, Exeter, writes lucidly and competently about man in relation to home, work, community, country, world and universe. Each chapter ends with questions for further study and books for further reading. Teachers of adolescents, leaders of youth groups and, indeed, intelligent young people who are seeking for Christian light on the deeper perplexities of the age will find help in this latest addition to the Gateway Handbooks of Religious Knowledge.

The Fellowship We Have to Share, by the Rev. R. Leonard Small (Saint Andrew Press; 2s. net), consists of four Broadcast addresses associated with the 'Tell Scotland' Movement. They are characterized by all the qualities of good modern preaching which we have previously noted in the author's work. We trust their invitation and challenge will be widely heeded.

Following a suggestion of the Third World Conference on Faith and Order the General Assembly of the Church of Scotland appointed a Commission to study the non-theological factors in Christian disunity. The Report of the Commission has now been published as *What Keeps Churches Apart?* (Saint Andrew Press; 1s. 3d.). The Commission has confined its view to Scotland, and has shown that non-theological factors like patronage were more potent than theological ones in the divisions of the Church of Scotland. To-day also non-theological factors operate in maintaining divisions, but it is held that it is mainly theological factors that have now to be overcome before further reunion is likely. The Report is marked by a humble spirit and a balanced judgment.

The latest of the Tyndale New Testament Commentaries is *The General Epistle of James*, by Professor R. V. G. Tasker, the General Editor of the series (Tyndale Press; 7s. 6d. net). It will greatly appeal to readers who share his critical conservatism. Others will doubt whether critical questions, for example authorship, are as candidly considered as the General Preface promises. With the best will in the world some of us cannot believe that the authorship of James of Jerusalem is 'undoubted.'

The commentary, made more or less phrase by phrase, puts the points with force, clarity and thoroughness, and great pains are taken to elicit the logical progress of the thought. Those who share Wheeler Robinson's view that the Epistle is very much 'an ethical scrapbook' may judge these pains misplaced. But the letter has unquestionably found in Professor Tasker a sympathetic commentator. Despite this *rapport* between writer and commentator, the Epistle remains, in the event, a rather sober-sided document, with no hint of the joy of the gospel. Perhaps James was that kind of person. But having ourselves a soft side for the *joculatores Dei* we rather regret the zest which informs the commentator's strictures on the temptations of merriment.

Some Devotional Literature

By the Reverend Charles Smith, M.A., The Vicarage, Heatherycleugh-in-Weardale

How to Pray, by Jean-Nicholas Grou.[1]
Meditations of a Believer, by Marcel Légaut.[2]
The Divine Prayer, by the Rt. Rev. Kenneth Mackenzie.[3]
Also the Holy Ghost, by a Religious of C.S.M.V.[4]

The group of books chosen for discussion in this article forms an excellent cross-section of devotional literature. Two are French, two English; two Roman Catholic, two Protestant, though both of a High variety; one from the eighteenth century, the others contemporary; all four are concerned with Prayer, though each of them deals with the subject from a quite different angle.

1. Jean-Nicholas Grou (1730–1803) stems from the great stream of writers on the higher levels of Prayer. His affinities are with the great Spaniards, and with a more direct lineage from S. François de Sales. It may be said without hesitation that his book is an unmitigated classic, absolutely timeless and universal in value. Indeed, it is so close-packed with valuable teaching that it is almost impossible to quote without misrepresenting.

By Prayer Grou understands the wordless Prayer of the Heart in which everything is implied though little or nothing is stated in words, and which is essentially the supernatural action of the Spirit praying within the human soul: 'Teach me to let thee act in my soul, and form in it the simple general prayer that defines nothing and expresses everything, that states nothing and includes everything' (p. 23).

And in the first five chapters he lays down remorselessly the stringent inward conditions taught us by God as the preconditions of such Prayer. 'Adoration, thanksgiving, the pardoning of sins and the obtaining of spiritual and temporal blessings' (p. 25). These, and in that order, are the four objects of Prayer: his discussion of them brings out the three realisms in which his greatness lies. Throughout, the book is governed by a tremendous sense of the majesty of God, a realistic acceptance of the human situation as it is, and an equally realistic awareness of its potentialities. 'This perfect and total dominion (of God) embraces everything and leaves us no liberty to dispose of a single thought, word, or deed. God by His grace must govern, rule, and control the entire man at all times, in all places, in all circumstances' (p. 125), yet '. . . as you are a Christian, a creature with a supernatural destiny, you must in everything be directed by grace and keep your destiny in view in all your actions. . . .' (p. 126).

Grou has a quite Teresan power of linking extremes. Thus he will comment that God 'is no more the God of Heaven than of earth . . . and His will, the origin of order, is essentially the only law of every intelligent creature, whether still upon the road, or come to the end of the journey' (p. 128). And a few pages earlier he has included social calls and good manners as acts in the life of Continual Prayer (p. 83). And his real grasp of normal psychology is well illustrated by his comment, '. . . most men are far more depressed by their fears for the future than by their discomforts in the present' (p. 139).

The book ends with a commentary on the Lord's Prayer, from which I shall not quote in detail because the general level of its profundity seems to me to be quite unmatched.

I have discussed this first book at some length because I am going to use it as the standard of comparison for the others. The translation is so good that one would never imagine that the book had originally been written in other than English. The numerous knife-edges along which any devotional book must necessarily walk, are all traversed without faltering—the knife-edges of sentimentality, of a platitudinous pseudo-profundity, of emotion become cloying, of the tiresome repetition of exclamations and apostrophes, of the heaping up of added clauses, adjectives, and adverbs. In short, the book is as nearly perfect as is humanly possible for a book about Prayer to be.

2. Légaut's book comes to us with a great reputation from both the Continent and America; indeed it is offered as a classic of the devotional life. In plan it is a book of prayer-meditations

[1] Tr. by Joseph Dalby, D.D. (James Clarke; 7s. 6d. net).
[2] Tr. by Siegwalt O. Palleske and Suzanne Palleske (Eyre and Spottiswoode; 15s. net).
[3] Mowbray; 3s. 6d. net.
[4] Mowbray; 4s. net.

upon details of the life of Christ, and the experiences of the Christian soul. It would not be unfair to describe the first three-fifths of it as Jesus-centric, and the remainder as Christo-centric mysticism. Its nearest affinity is perhaps with the *Little Book of Eternal Wisdom* of Henry Suso, and the comparison does show the worth of the Meditations. The following quotation on Renunciation will show the quality of thought and writing: 'Never has the world appeared so beautiful, now that we must turn away from it. . . . Our soul, which the call of Christ has raised out of the commonplace, now finds in the world a nourishment that fills it with ecstasy. . . . And now our soul is to leave all that; it is to turn away from the manifold splendours and strive only for the single Splendour' (p. 53 f.).

Constantly we meet with echoes of the true mystical tradition: 'And our physical death is the symbol of the necessity of our spiritual abnegation. In this way, truly, Christ will live in us, will live again His earthly life in us, borrowing the human circumstances in which we find ourselves' (p. 60).

Profound insights occur on almost every page: imaginative insights into the experiences of Christ, psychological insights into the human soul: 'How can I steer my way when there are always at least two alternatives to be considered, when I am to be gentle without cowardice, strong without brutality, detached without indifference, enthusiastic without selfishness, self-sacrificing but without forgetting that God loves us and needs us, loving God as a person but without making Him unconsciously a man like one of us?' (p. 91). 'In leading me through Your humanity to the roots of my being, You have led me less to an end than to a point from which the horizon widens out to comprise in a mysterious way even Your divinity' (p. 117).

And there is an endless wealth of, usually felicitous, imagery: '. . . the amazing conflict between the leaven and the dough, the leaven that is always buried, always on the point of being choked, and the dough at all times heavy but at all times affected, always on the point of victory and yet always a little defeated' (p. 234).

Finally, many of the asides and comments are at the truly mystical level: '. . . we must go through hours when Christ is still crucified in those who have served Him well. . . .' (p. 238).

Those few inadequate samples must serve as a taste of the great riches to be found in the book. I think it probably is a classic of and for our time: whether it is a classic for all time I am not so sure. Examples could be quoted of each of the knife-edges listed above, from which the book comes down upon the wrong side. That is true of Henry Suso, no doubt, but there is a genius and strength in him which enable him to walk very dangerously, knowing well that his Eckhartian foundations will never allow him to sink too far below the level proper to a Neo-Platonic philosopher. It may be true that there are certain expressions of affective tendency, certain heapings-up of emotive clauses, which do not easily survive the change into a foreign language: it is certainly true that the general rhythm of the translation is not the rhythm of one who naturally writes in English. The book is a handsome one, though some eight or nine misprints occur in it.

3. Bishop Mackenzie's book is at a different level, both of ambition and appeal, from the previous two. It is written for the ordinary Christian, not for the man whose feet aspire to be set upon the Way of Perfection. And as such it is an excellent little work. It supplies a background, clause by clause to the Lord's Prayer, filling out the theological, ethical, and practical content of the Prayer with elevated commonsense and great charm. The style is informal and intimate: 'Those who are called to the religious life have no property of their own: their food is very simple, their clothes cost very little. But it is not true that we ought all to live as cheaply as possible. Good clothes and good and well-cooked food are better than bad. . .' (p. 37). How true, and how refreshing to find it in a book on Prayer! 'Most of us do not seem to be called to be great saints and to have the opportunity of exercising heroic virtue: but we, the average men and women, called, it seems, to be very little saints, have to achieve our wee sanctity the hard way; because there is no other' (p. 54).

I shall not quote more, because the charm and value of the book is not only its 'wholeness,' but even more the charm of the writer which shines through its texture. All we average men should read it with great profit.

4. I have classified *Also the Holy Ghost* as a book of devotion, because it is really a devotional study of the twofold Incarnation, in Scripture and in Jesus of Nazareth. So long as it remains a book of devotion it is a good one: '. . . these two Words, the Word enscriptured and the Word made flesh, are one and the same message' (p. 12). '. . . the Incarnation was a preparing from the foundation of the world' (p. 55).

Such epigrams as these are frequent and often illuminating. But unfortunately the book professes to become other than a book of devotion: it sets out to deal with Biblical difficulties: and as soon as it does so, its level changes profoundly.

One Aspect of the Biblical Conception of Faith

By the Reverend Professor Thomas F. Torrance, D.D., D.Theol., The University of Edinburgh

Several scholars have recently called for a reconsideration of faith as faithfulness answering to and dependent upon the Divine faithfulness. Certainly the New Testament conception of faith (*pistis*) is much more than that, for in faith the intellectual element of belief is powerfully represented, but even so this intellectual aspect of faith in the Biblical context is grounded upon the basic fact of the faithfulness of God and falls within the determination of man's obedient and faithful response to the covenant-mercies of God.

The Hebrew root that concerns us here is *'mn*, with the meaning of firm, steadfast, together with the terms, *'aman* and *'emunah*, with corresponding meanings, etc. As in the case of so many Hebrew words, the fundamental significance of *'mn* seems to be related closely to the intense family-consciousness of Israel. Thus, as Arthur Weiser points out (in the article on *pistis* in *KTWzNT*, v. 183 f.), the *qal*, *'aman*, is applied to a mother, or a nurse, or the guardian of a child, with reference to the faithfulness and reliability of that relationship. Thus, too, *'ōmēn*, *ōmeneth*, means a nurse, or a trustee, and *'omnah* means nursing or bringing up. And so *'ōmen* comes to refer to faithfulness in that light. Thus the vivid picture of the constancy and steadfastness of a parent to her child lurks behind the Old Testament conception of faithfulness.

This is the conception of steadfastness which in the Old Testament is applied to God in His covenant-faithfulness. For example, in Dt 7^9 it is used to speak of God's constancy in keeping covenant and *ḥesed* (RSV, 'steadfast love') with His people, and in Is 49^7 it is applied to the faithfulness of God in His election of the Servant, to whom He will not only prove utterly faithful but for whom He will fulfil all His promises. Then this is described in *v.* 15 f. in the familiar words: 'Can a woman forget her sucking child, that she should not have compassion on the son of her womb? yea, these may forget, yet will not I forget thee.'

This conception of steadfastness or faithfulness is also applied in the Old Testament in a religious sense to people, such as the servant of God (Moses, Nu 12^7), witnesses (Is 8^2, Jer 42^5), messengers (Pr 25^{13}), prophets (1 S 3^{20}), priests (1 S 2^{35}), and so on. But the conception of *'emunah* is applied above all to God.

To illustrate that, A. G. Hebert, in a recent article, cites Ps 36^{5-7}, and then comments as follows: 'As the psalmist implies, the Hebrew word denoting steadfastness and firmness applies properly to God and not to man, who is repeatedly characterized as physically frail ("All flesh is as grass . . . the grass withereth, the flower fadeth: but the word of our God shall stand for ever"—Is 40^{6-8}) and as morally unstable (as in the first four verses of Ps 36, where the ungodly man "flatters himself in his own eyes" and his words are "iniquity and deceit"). Hence the words "faith" and "to believe" (*he'emin*) do not properly describe a virtue or quality of man; they describe *man as taking refuge from his own frailty and instability in God who is firm and steadfast.* So in Is 7^9 the prophet says to the weak and timid King Ahaz, who is scared of the kings of Syria and northern Israel, "If ye will not believe, ye shall not be established"—if you will not make-yourselves-firm (on God), you will not be made firm' (*Theology*, lviii. No. 424 [Oct., 1955], 374).

From this it is clear that we are faced with a problem when we have to translate the Hebrew into Greek, for the Greek *pistis* and *pisteuein* are not very happy equivalents for the words denoting faithfulness in Hebrew; *pistos*, however, is more applicable. Certainly the LXX is very uneasy about their use, and significant facts emerge which require far greater consideration than, I think, we have given to them. *Pistis*, for example, is never used in the LXX to signify 'faith' or 'belief,' and *pistoi* is not used to describe the Old Testament 'believers'—indeed it occurs but once in the canonical books in application to the members of the covenant-community, in Ps 101^6: 'Mine eyes are upon the faithful (*pistous*) of the land,' where clearly *pistoi* is properly rendered 'faithful.' The term *pisteuein* is used frequently in the LXX and used also in a strict religious sense, but this usage is dominated by the Old Testament conception of faithfulness.

The verb *'aman* has, it would appear, mainly a twofold usage. Primarily, it is used to mean 'to make firm,' 'to establish,' 'to ground in the truth,' and as such is sometimes translated in the LXX by *sterizein*. This meaning is apparent in many New Testament passages, of which we give two examples—

2 *Th* 3^3: 'Faithful (*pistos*) is the Lord who will strengthen (*sterizei*) you.'

Lk 22[31f.] : 'Satan has desired to have you, that he may sift you as wheat : But I have prayed for you that your faith (*pistis*) fail not : and when you are converted, strengthen (*sterison*) your brethren.'

The other use of *'aman* which we may note refers to 'believing in' or 'relying on,' where the LXX translates by *pisteuein* or a compound form of it. Here we may cite two typical instances.

Gn 15[6] : 'Abraham believed (*episteusen*) God and it was counted unto him for righteousness (*dikaiosunen*).'

2 *Ch* 20[20] : 'Believe in (*empisteusate*) the Lord your God and ye shall be established (*empisteuthesesthe*).'

In all these, and many similar instances, in the Old Testament and the New Testament, the main emphasis is upon establishment or reliance upon God or upon the Truth in the Hebrew sense of the word for 'truth.'

That brings us to examine the concept of *'emeth*, the primary word in Hebrew for 'truth.' *'emeth* derives, of course, from the same root as *'emunah*, and indeed there does not seem to be a great deal of difference between *'emeth* and *'emunah*. There is a wide area, at any rate, in which they overlap in their meaning.

The usual translation of *'emeth* in the LXX is *aletheia*, but *aletheia* is not used to signify abstract or metaphysical truth, but what is grounded upon God's faithfulness, *i.e.* truth not as something static, but as active, efficacious reality, the reality of God in covenant-relationship. It is the steadfastness of God which is the ground of all truth. Primarily, truth is God's being true to Himself, His faithfulness or consistency. God's Truth means, therefore, that He keeps truth or faith with His people and requires them to keep truth or faith with Him. Thus the Hebrew *'emeth* is translated not only by *aletheia* but also by *pistis* and *dikaiosune*. There is no doubt that again and again where we have the words *pistis* and *dikaiosune* in the New Testament we must see behind them the Hebrew words, *'emeth* and *'emunah*, and where in the New Testament we have *aletheia* we must understand that not simply as a Greek word, but in the light of the Biblical inclusion of *pistis* and *dikaiosune* in the concept of truth.

Because in the Biblical context truth is grounded upon the Divine faithfulness and the covenant-relation which it sets up, truth is also concerned with the event of the word through which relation between God and man, and man and man takes place. It is in and through the word-event relationship that God's Truth is revealed and becomes efficacious reality among men. Here, of course, we have to do with the familiar Old Testament conception that when word and event coincide there is *'emeth* or truth. This is applied above all to God's Word, for when His deed corresponds to His Word, that is Truth. Truth is the faithfulness between God's actions and His Word. His Word accomplishing its purpose, actualizing itself, is the Truth with which men have to do, and it is with that Truth and Word of Truth that the prophets are burdened. The mighty Word of God enacts itself as Truth in the midst of God's people, for when through the prophets the Word of God reveals God and establishes His will, there is His Truth. Then God's Truth is fulfilled and actualized.

In the nature of the case this Divine Word pressing to its Truth among men requires truth from the side of man in answer to it : man must walk before God in truth, and all his living, doing, speaking is to be a living of the truth, a doing of the truth, and a speaking of the truth. But when God's people prove unfaithful and untrue, His Truth becomes their judgment, and so *'emeth* is also used juridically or forensically. God keeps faith and keeps truth with sinners in judgment of sin, in vindication of the right, in justification. But out of this there arises the conception of God's Truth as a supreme eschatological and Messianic conception, especially in Isaiah, Deutero-Isaiah, and in many Psalms. God is faithful who will bring His Word of Truth to pass in spite of all the unfaithfulness of His people, in spite of all the sin of man. When God's Word is finally established as Truth, when God has finally acted, the Messianic Kingdom will be established. Truth shall spring out of the earth, and a throne will be established in mercy and one shall sit on it in truth. It is this conception that forms such a powerful ingredient in the notion of the Servant in Deutero-Isaiah, for in and through the Servant the faithfulness of God both in judgment and in redemption presses toward its complete fulfilment in all the relations between God and His own.

When we turn over the pages to the New Testament and find this language being used and these conceptions being employed in the interpretation of Christ and the gospel, it becomes evident that Jesus Christ is understood as *the incarnate faithfulness of God*, the Word of God at last become event in our flesh in the fullest sense. 'He is the Faithful and the True, the Amen.' He is the Truth of God actualized in our midst—that is the Faithfulness of Christ Jesus (*pistis Christou Iesou*) of which St. Paul speaks so often (see *The Church of Scotland Interim Report on Baptism* [1955], 46–52).

The New Testament conception of faith has a great wealth and variety which it is impossible to discuss here, where we are limiting ourselves

to one main, fundamental aspect, but there are many passages where the usual translations are inadequate and where considerable light is brought to bear upon them from the Old Testament conceptions we have been discussing. Most of these passages have been adduced by Dr. Hebert in the valuable article referred to earlier. For our purpose here a selection will serve to indicate the line of interpretation that we must follow—

> 2 *Th* 2^{13} : ' God chose you from the beginning unto salvation in sanctification of the Spirit and faith of the truth ' (*pistei aletheias*).

In Greek ' faith of the truth ' is an awkward expression, but it is clear from the Old Testament background that for St. Paul neither *pistis* nor *aletheia* will express fully what he is after, and so he puts both words together to convey what the Old Testament means by *'emeth* and/or *'emunah*.

> *Ro* 3^{3} : ' Shall their faithlessness (*apistia*) make of none effect the faithfulness (*pistin*) of God ? '

Difficult as the Greek is, the *pistis* of God, it expresses very excellent Biblical teaching. The fundamental reality of our salvation is the Divine faithfulness, and this in St. Paul's Epistles is equivalent to *dikaiosune*, righteousness, and in the Johannine writings, to *aletheia*, truth : all of these terms in the LXX may render the same Hebrew conception. Surely it is in this light that we are to translate

> *Ro* 1^{17} : ' The righteousness of God is revealed from faith (*pisteos*) to faith (*pistin*).'

That is to say, the righteousness of God is revealed from God's *pistis* to man's *pistis*, but man's *pistis* is his implication in the Divine *pistis*. God draws man within the sphere of His own faithfulness and righteousness and gives man to share in it, so that his faith is embraced by God's faithfulness. It is in precisely the same sense that St. Paul employs his favourite ' *Pistos* is God who . . . ,' and then goes on to speak of man's salvation, or righteousness or faith in its utter reliance upon the Divine faithfulness. That is the whole point of

> *Ro* $3^{21\text{-}25}$: ' God's *dikaiosune* is manifested through the *pistis* of Christ to all who believe (*tous pisteuontas*).'

Another set of significant passages we may take from the Epistle to the Galatians.

> *Gal* 2^{16} : ' We . . . knowing that a man is not justified by the works of the law, but through the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (*dia pisteos Christou Iesou*), even we believed (*episteusamen*) on Christ Jesus that we might be justified out of Christ's faithfulness (*ek pisteos Christou*), and not by the works of the law.'
>
> *Gal* 2^{20} : ' I have been crucified with Christ ; yet I live ; and yet no longer I, but Christ liveth in me : and that life which I now live in the flesh I live in faith, the (*faithfulness*) which is of the Son of God (*en pistei te tou huiou tou theou*) who loved me and gave himself for me.'
>
> *Gal* 3^{22} : ' . . . that the promise which derives from the faithfulness of Jesus Christ (*ek pisteos Iesou Christou*) might be given to them that believe (*tois pisteuousin*).'

In most of these passages the *pistis Iesou Christou* does not refer only either to the faithfulness of Christ or to the answering faithfulness of man, but is essentially a polarized expression denoting the faithfulness of Christ as its main ingredient but also involving or at least suggesting the answering faithfulness of man, and so his belief in Christ, but even within itself the faithfulness of Christ involves both the faithfulness of God and the faithfulness of the man Jesus. These typical passages from the Epistle to the Galatians give us the supreme difference between the Old Testament and the New Testament. Like the Old Testament, the New Testament also lays emphasis upon the faithfulness of God, and requires from man a corresponding faithfulness. But in the gospel the steadfast faithfulness of God has achieved its end in righteousness and truth in Jesus Christ, for in Him it has been actualized as Truth, and is fulfilled in our midst. Jesus Christ is not only the Truth of God but also Truth of God become man, the Truth of God become truth of man. As such Jesus is also the truth of man before God, for God, and toward God. Jesus Christ is thus not only the incarnation of the Divine *pistis*, but He is the embodiment and actualization of man's *pistis* in covenant with God. He is not only the Righteousness of God, but the embodiment and actualization of our human righteousness before God. Thus St. Paul writes to the Philippians (3^{9}) : ' . . . not having a righteousness of my own, based on law, but that which is through the faithfulness of Christ (*dia pisteos Christou*), the righteousness from God that depends on faith (*epi te pistei*).'

To expound this more fully we should have to go into the whole doctrine of the Atonement through the obedience of Jesus Christ, and of our involvement in the whole movement of the Incarnation from the birth of Jesus to His ascension, and we cannot do that here. It may be sufficient to say that in the incarnate life of Jesus Christ, the Son of God become man among estranged men, we have the life of One who was God the Judge of man, and who was man judged by God ; who was God bestowing Himself upon man in utter love, and who was man in obedient self-offering

to God. In that life of union between God and man Christ manifested a twofold steadfastness or faithfulness: the steadfastness of God and the steadfastness of man in obedience to God; the steadfastness of God the Word revealing Himself to man, and the steadfastness of man believing and trusting in His Word and living faithfully upon it. Jesus Christ is God being true to Himself steadfastly and faithfully in the midst of our human estrangement, into which He entered in grace and steadfast love. Jesus Christ is man being perfectly true to God, steadfastly and faithfully obedient to God, the Amen of truth to God's truth. He is from the side of man, man's *pistis* answering to God's *pistis*, as well as from the side of God, God's *pistis* requiring man's *pistis*: as such He lived out the life of the Servant, fulfilling in Himself our salvation in righteousness and truth.

All that is remarkably summed up in 2 Co $1^{18f.}$, according to which Jesus Christ is not only the faithful *Yes* of God to man, but is also the faithful *Amen* of man to God. He offers to God for us, and is toward God in His own person and life, our human response of obedience and faithfulness. Here there are two great aspects of the Christian gospel which need to receive from us much fuller consideration than they have found in modern theology.

(*a*) The whole of our salvation depends upon the faithfulness of God who does not grow weary of being faithful. It is God's faithfulness that undergirds our feeble and faltering faith and enfolds it in His own. In Christ Jesus we are in fact unable to disentangle our faith from the faithfulness of God, for it belongs to our faith to be implicated in the faithfulness of God incarnated among us in Jesus Christ.

(*b*) Jesus Christ is not only the Word of God become flesh, He is also Believer, but Believer for us, vicariously Believer, whose very humanity is the embodiment of our salvation. In Him who is Man of our humanity, we are graciously given to share, and so to participate in the whole course of His reconciling obedience from His birth to His death. That He stood in our place and gave to God account for us, that He believed for us, was faithful for us, and remains faithful even when we fail Him again and again, is the very substance of our salvation and the anchor of our hope.

In the Study

Virginibus Puerisque

Looking unto Jesus

By the Reverend J. Ithel Jones, M.A., B.D., London

We played a wonderful game at a party last week. I've never seen people laugh so much. And what made it all the more delightful was that it was such a simple game.

This, briefly, is what happened. Six people were sent out of the room. Then the Master of Ceremonies told us that he was going to go through a little act. He was going to pretend to be a bus conductor. In 'dumb-show' he would ring the 'go-ahead' bell and then climb the stairs of his double-decker and book fares on the top deck. Then he would come down the stairs and ring the bell again for the bus to stop. That's all. Now the people who had been sent out knew nothing of this.

So he called number one of the six back into the room and went through the act for him, without telling him what it was all about. This man, now, had to act in front of number two what he thought the Master of Ceremonies had done. Then number two called in number three and went through the mime again. And so on until the sixth man had gone through the act.

You could scarcely believe your eyes! Each one got something wrong and gradually the act changed completely. The Master of Ceremonies had started with a bus-conductor act. The sixth man thought he was a drummer in a military band!

The trouble was, of course, that number two was looking at number one, who was an imperfect copy of the original. Number three was in a still worse position, he had to watch an imperfect copy of an imperfect copy. And so it got worse and worse.

Now that's only a game. And as a game it's great fun. But there are some who think that that is just what's wrong with Christians to-day. When Jesus was baptized, God said, 'This is my beloved son; listen to Him.' But instead of listening to Him and following His pattern, we tend to listen to other Christians and to compare ourselves with them. They, in turn, may well have done the same, and we become far removed from the original pattern. We must not copy imperfect Christians. We must copy Christ.

It is true that St. Paul once said, 'You follow me, as I follow Christ.' But we must remember that when he said that, the Four Gospels had not been written.

We are in a better position than were the Christians of those very early days. We have the full story of what Jesus was like. We do not need to copy copies.

The Battle Ensign

By the Reverend John R. Gray, V.R.D., B.D., Th.M., Glasgow

'Who is on the lord's side?'—Ex 32^{26}.

Some months ago I spent some time in an aircraft carrier. One day a particularly big flag was wanted to do some decoration on the ship, and some one suggested that we try to borrow the Battle Ensign. When I asked why we should use the Battle Ensign for such a peaceful purpose I was told that it was far and away the biggest flag in any of Her Majesty's ships of war. And you see why that should be so, don't you? In the thick of a naval engagement, amidst all the smoke and confusion, the ships of the Royal Navy fly this huge flag that all may know, friend and enemy alike, whose ships they are and whom they serve. That, too, was what uniform was for, at least at first, that all might know whose side a soldier was on.

There is no uniform for God's army, for the soldiers of Christ, but if we really belong to it we shall want people to know. And they will know, not so much by how we look, but by what we say and how we behave. Even although we do not very often speak of Christ, if we are kind and cheerful and true, people will know that we are 'On the Lord's side.'

The Christian Year

Third Sunday after Epiphany

Christian Assurance

By the Reverend Douglas Stewart, M.A., London

'And we ourselves know and we confide in the love which God has for us.'—1 Jn 4^{16} (Weymouth).

1. 'We ourselves know.' Are Christians at all aware of the offence that that claim gives to the non-Christian majority around us? To them, inevitably, we appear to be either ignorant or arrogant when we claim to *know* about the love of God.

For consider the universe around us, macroscopic or microscopic. Man is set between the world of the infinitely vast and the world of the infinitely little, and, whether he looks out at the flaming nebulae pouring forth their energies through unimaginable æons of time into the cold depths of interstellar space, or investigates the mystery of atomic structure and energy, there is nothing there in all that welter of matter in space and time which remotely suggests that God is love. The new vision of man's life set amid forces, 'which care nothing for his hopes and fears,' seems, as Bertrand Russell has claimed, to point only to despair. Are Christians aware of the shock from which humanity is suffering through the discovery that man is a castaway in the universe?

Or consider the history of man on his planet. 'The Martyrdom of Man' is not a bad title for the story. In our own century we have sufficiently experienced the power of evil over the lives of men. We could not deduce, either from general history, or from the history we ourselves have lived, 'the love which God has for us,' and how could we 'confide in it'?

Add to the new scientific view of reality, and to the history of mankind, our personal experience of life. The secret fears, the hidden shame, the long frustration, the hopeless waiting, the dreams unfulfilled, the vision faded.

2. What would St. John say to our modern despair? Upon what did he base his confidence? Was he arrogant—or just ignorant? It would be foolish to suggest that St. John shared our modern vision of the Universe around us, but it would be still more foolish to imagine that men in classical times felt more at home with Nature than we do. First-century man was as keenly aware of the hostility of universal forces as we can be. And as to history, which century can you choose which might be said to teach a different lesson from our own? Certainly not the first century. Nor was personal human life in that age of decline and fall any happier than now.

St. John, we may conceive, would be unmoved by the arguments reproduced above, not because he could not feel their force, but because none of them touches the real heart of his assertion. 'We ourselves know and we confide in the love which God has for us,' not because of a deduction from Nature, history or experience, but because of Christ. 'I saw Him, followed Him, heard Him, touched Him, loved Him.' That is the central message of the gospel and the epistles. And that is the heart of the Christian certainty. We know the love of God because we know Christ.

3. For some minds this is not offensive so long as it is confined to the first generation of Christians. John did know, and Andrew and James and Peter. Undoubtedly they shared a unique human experience. They had the right, perhaps, to draw from it some deduction about the love of God. But in the nature of the case their experience cannot be the experience of any man now.

> Now he is dead! Far hence he lies
> In the lorn Syrian town;
> And on his grave, with shining eyes,
> The Syrian stars look down.

This is the twentieth century. Jesus has been gone a long time.

All of which is true, but it overlooks the strange reversal of history in our experience of Jesus. For there is a real sense in which Christians to-day know Christ as the first generation could not. 'Whom do men say that I am?' What limited answers they gave, arising out of their limited experience: 'John the Baptist,' 'Jeremiah,' 'a prophet.'

For us, from our new perspective, Jesus is an infinitely greater figure. We see Him 'towering o'er the wrecks of time.' Since the days of His flesh the world has changed and changed again. Emperors, soldiers, saints, prophets, philosophers, artists, martyrs, revolutionaries have crowded the historic stage. We see that He transcends all human greatness.

How impressed they were by what they thought of as the universality of Christ on the day of Pentecost. 'Parthians and Medes and Elamites and the dwellers in Mesopotamia . . . in Egypt . . . Cretes and Arabians.' Their world. What a small world. The world of the Mediterranean basin. The shattering truth that He could save the Gentiles travailed for birth in that Early Church, for at Pentecost it was the far-flung children of Israel who heard the gospel. To them the Christendom we know was beyond all imagination. 'We know' the power of Christ as the New Testament writers never could. 'We ourselves know and we confide in the love which God has for us.'

4. 'I do not know.' That is the last refuge of the sceptic. 'I have not experienced Christ. I don't deny your experience, but it has never happened to me.' In one sense we have created this difficulty for ourselves. We have so often preached Christ in terms of 'experience,' that many feel they have the right to deny Him on the basis of their inexperience. The egoism of modern man would make him the measure of all things, including the nature of God.

But the fact of Christ is more than a subjective fact—it is that, of course, but it is objective also. You have not experienced smallpox, do you then not believe in smallpox? 'I've seen the marks of it on others.' Have you not seen the marks of Christ on others?

Along the Congo river in Africa there are graves. They are the graves of men and women born and educated in Britain who, humanly speaking, had nothing to gain by going to Africa. Doctors, nurses, engineers, teachers, evangelists, they might have lived useful and comfortable lives at home. Instead they went to Africa for Christ's sake and some of them died within weeks of their arrival because of our ignorance of climate and tropical disease. And out of that sacrifice has arisen the African Church with its thousands of primitive men and women at this moment awaiting baptism. And, in the Providence of God, it may be that their sacrifice will be remembered in the fateful clash of white and black in that great continent.

That is only one small, isolated example of the reality of Christ in the history of men. It can be paralleled in every century and on every continent. 'We know.' For two thousand years we have seen the miracle unfold. In a million lives the marks of the Cross are visible. The denial of Christ is a denial of that continuing river of mercy and charity which is the unseen source of all civilized existence.

5. 'We know.' 'We confide.' But why do you not know? Why has the experience not come to you? The fundamental reason is a simple one. You are saying, 'Let me know, and then I will trust.' The Bible is saying, 'Trust, and then you will know.' You do not know the love of God because you do not confide in it. You are bitter, and life is frustrating, because your trust is in the wrong things; in reason, in your own personality, in money or fame, or political action, in human love, in art, in idealism. There is a mental polytheism of the West which matches the objective polytheism of the East, and which leads to despair. The secret of life lies in trusting God.

Fourth Sunday after Epiphany

Fearfulness

By the Reverend Robert Menzies, D.D., Glasgow

'And Jesus said unto them, Why are ye so fearful? how is it that ye have no faith?'—Mk 4^{40}.

From this incident that is replete with spiritual suggestion we propose to extract only one line of thought, namely, our Lord's criticism of His disciples' behaviour in this sudden storm that swept the Galilean sea. 'Why are ye so fearful? How is it that ye have no faith?' In these words Jesus raises a central problem about human life. 'Why are ye so fearful?' Fearful is the right adjective to apply to their condition. There would

be no reproach in being afraid. Fear is a biological instinct implanted in our being to protect us from needless risks and to promote our efficiency. Fearfulness, however, is quite a different matter. It is fear driven to excess, gone wild and rank, out of hand and beyond control. It serves no efficient end, tends to destroy and paralyse rather than quicken and construct. It is responsible for the numerous types of phobias which set the psychiatrists their problem. In its extreme forms it may completely derange the mind. Its widespread incidence is reflected in these words of H. G. Wells, 'As night goes round the earth, always there are hundreds of thousands of people who should be sleeping, lying awake in their beds, fearing a bully, fearing a competition, dreading lest they cannot make good, ill of some illness they cannot comprehend, distressed by some irrational quarrel, maddened by some thwarted instinct or some suppressed and thwarted desire.' Such being our condition the question of Jesus becomes acutely relevant.

It may be useful at this point to try to group our major fears under some general scheme, and try to discover what prescription our Lord has to offer for overcoming them. Victor Hugo helps us here. In his great trilogy of novels which should be read in sequence he classifies these fears. The first, *The Toilers of the Sea*, deals with man's fear of Nature, the second, *Les Misérables*, with man's fear of society, the third, *Notre Dame de Paris*, deals with man's fear of God.

(1) *Fear of Nature.* Nature launches its terrific thunderbolts—volcanoes, earthquakes, typhoons, floods, droughts, and who of the sons of men can abide their fury? That is in the large, but there are also Nature's germ assaults, pestilence, disease, attacking and disintegrating the body. And in the rear stalks the figure of death whose claims every man born of woman must honour. These all produce their own crop of corroding fears and the question presses: Can Jesus do anything to meet, match and master these fears?

Jesus has very little to say about the problem of natural evil. He never regarded the world of Nature as His enemy but as His friend. That deep sleep of His in a boat in deadly danger of being swamped is highly significant. He slept because He knew that His Father watched. He conveys to us the comfortable feeling that whatever storms were raging, however menacing were the forces of Nature, the same condition prevailed. The world of Nature was God's creation, not the work of some other power hostile to man, and, that being so, men should be at peace in their hearts. How is it that ye have no faith?

(2) *Fear of Society.* The pressure of social opinion and more particularly of social action produces its own crop of fears. Few people are courageous enough to resist the power of public opinion, whether it be true or false. Many of the sins of adolescents have their roots in fear. They drink and gamble and do other things that are evil because this is the fashion of the social set in which they move. They betray Christ, like Peter, through fear of being ridiculed or compromised. Men tell lies through fear of the consequences of telling the truth. 'The fear of man,' says the wise man, 'bringeth a snare.' Society not only judges but acts. Human beings are capable of treating each other with sadistic cruelty. Loyalty to principle in business may fling a man into the ranks of the unemployed. Refusal to function in a rotten political system may bring a man to the concentration camp or death. The sponsors of the Christian cause have frequently earned the reward of martyrdom. It is human beings, not God, who are responsible for waging wars, and while fear is responsible for most wars between nations, it in turn sows its own dragon's teeth. The fear of society, the judgments it pronounces, the cruelties it perpetrates, create a major problem for mankind. How can we get rid of these fears? There is only one way, and that is to meet the fear-complex with the faith-complex. To have faith means that we attach more importance to the judgment of God than of men. This automatically relieves the pressure on our mind of the tyranny of public opinion. All the fears which group themselves round economic insecurity and the means of livelihood melt away before the conviction that we have a Father in heaven who knows that we have need of all these things. As to social action, the things that evil men do to each other, Jesus would have us learn that their power is strictly limited. For Jesus would have us know that in the last resort they are powerless to destroy the soul. They can only destroy the body. He speaks of death to those who are living the filial life as an unimportant incident in a man's career. 'Do not be afraid of those that kill the body,' for after that trifle 'they are helpless to do anything further.' Once we have companied with Jesus and in His faith faced and laid low that ultimate terror, there is little else that fear can do to us.

(3) *The Fear of God.* Another crop of fears has gathered round this focal centre. A failure on man's part to grasp the true nature of ultimate reality has been responsible for needlessly multiplying the area of fear. 'I remembered God, and was troubled,' said the Psalmist. 'I feared Thee,' said the one-talented man, 'knowing Thee to be an austere man.' Holding these views men have tried to placate God. They have offered Him gifts, sacrifices, even human sacrifices to avert His anger. Even the Atonement has often been falsely

represented as the slaying of a sinless victim to satisfy the demands of an outraged Deity.

It is Jesus' most signal contribution to the elimination of fear that He laid bare before men's eyes the real nature of God. To see His face as Jesus showed it to us, to know His mind as revealed in His teaching, and to learn His purpose of grace as traced in the mission of His Son is to put an end to every fear which the thought of God creates. 'Well roars the storm,' wrote Stevenson, 'to those who hear a deeper voice across the storm'. And all that that voice says to the troubled hearts of men is this 'It is I, be not afraid.'

FIFTH SUNDAY AFTER EPIPHANY

The Garment of Patience

BY THE REVEREND R. WATSON MATHEWSON, B.D., S.T.M., EDINBURGH

'Put on then, as God's chosen ones, holy and beloved, . . . patience, forbearing one another . . . forgiving each other.'—Col $3^{12f.}$ (R.S.V.).

St. Paul remembers here the age-old and universal convention whereby a man's status is marked by his dress. The soldier is recognized by his uniform, and his rank by its badges; the colour of the craftsman's apron reveals the nature of his craft; the priest and the peer have their distinctive vestments.

Our increasing uniformity in modern dress may be causing many of these distinguishing marks to disappear, but to some extent they still exist. The grand occasion revives them, and especially an initiation—a graduation ceremony, an investiture, a passing-out parade.

Then the dress is donned with solemnity and worn with pride. Its wearer recognizes that it is not to be dishonoured, since in the eyes of society it is the guarantee that he actually possesses those qualities for which the right to wear it is accorded.

So, says St. Paul to his fellow-Christians and to us, you have been initiated into the new humanity, into a company whose status is pre-eminent because it is of heaven. You have been chosen and purified and loved by God Himself. Put on, therefore, the garment appropriate to your high calling.

But the appropriate robe for the Christian seems strangely inappropriate to his exalted status. 'Put on compassion, kindliness, humility, gentleness and patience.' The garment St. Paul describes will never be fashionable in a world where the vogue is so consistently for the conspicuous and the opulent, but at least by its very lowliness it will be distinctive. Particularly will this be so because so predominant in the weaving of it is the thread of patience, and patience, in the full meaning of the word, is a virtue that belongs exclusively to the new humanity in Christ. To the Greeks, in fact, it was not a virtue at all but a vice, which no doubt it is in the proverbial Oriental version, passive resignation to the inevitability of suffering.

But the kind of patience that the Christian is to exercise cannot be negative for it is derived from the patience of God Himself. The whole Bible is the record of that amazing patience, that Divine refusal to acquiesce in the inevitability of anything. Although the word itself rarely occurs in the Old Testament it can be read between the lines of practically every page—God patiently wrestling with that rebellious chosen race of His, or like a potter, taking the faulty human material that is marred in the making and patiently shaping it into a new vessel that will still be able to accomplish His almighty purpose.

It is there, too, in the New Testament, in the One who was the patience of God incarnate. How patiently Jesus bore with His disciples, with temperamental Peter, with questioning Thomas, even with false Judas. How patient He was with the multitude of the sick and their constant demands upon His strength. How patient He was even with those who crucified Him, to the end retaining His persistent yearning for their salvation —'Father, forgive them; for they know not what they do.' Jesus never utterly gives up any one.

So it is because God Himself is so tenaciously patient with us that we are bound to be patient with one another. For how can I say to my neighbour that my patience with him is exhausted when I know that I could not continue another day in life were God's patience with me to fail?

It is in this realm of personal relationships that the Christian will always be recognized by the apparel of patience, and particularly in the realm of personal relationships within the fellowship of the Church. For in the Church's other relationships patience is not the inviolable law of all its policy. The Church that has not the courage in moments of world crisis to act or speak impetuously, but waits till memory fades and conscience is dulled and the issues are confused before venturing its cautious rebukes is not worthy of the One who in a fury of impatience strode through the desecrated temple courts. Where the Church faces the obstinate evils of the world and its own inherent weaknesses its mood must be one of perpetual impatience.

But where the issues are individual and personal, within or outside the Christian community, the Saviour can do His work only through the patience of His disciples.

Such patience, says St. Paul, is to work itself out in the everyday life of the community particularly in the realm of reconciliation. Where one member is in any way sinned against by another, he is to practise patience in two respects.

First, in *forbearance*. Forbearance is the exercise of mercy where the natural inclination would be to act in terms of strict justice. I may fully deserve my neighbour's censure for the word I spoke against him, for the detrimental deed. Justice would decree an explosion of anger, and an end to our fellowship; but forbearance keeps the axe from falling, forbearance refrains from breaking the bruised reed.

When we thus exercise Christian forbearance we are only doing what God has all along done with us, God who is slow to anger and plenteous in mercy. You and I know that the one thing we cannot ask of Him is justice, for if we received it we would be without hope. Accordingly we are in no position to deal with our fellows in terms of strict justice either. The rectitude which makes a virtue of insisting on its rights may have its place in a court of law but does not properly belong to a Christian community. There, anxious consideration for the reclamation of the culprit takes precedence over the restoration of any personal rights that may have been infringed by his offence. An outburst of anger against him may no doubt be justifiable but it will drive him from the fellowship. Rather be slow to anger, exercise forbearance and he is given time to repent and to find his feet again within the family whose members are alike only in their dependence on the forbearance of God.

Secondly, the Christian is to practise patience in *forgiveness*. A single act of forgiveness may call for little patience but repeated demands for pardon, possibly for the same often repeated sin, will involve its exercise to a high degree.

Here St. Paul seems to be thinking of the forgiveness that is required often. 'Be always ready to forgive.'

Again the necessity laid upon the Christian to set no limits to the extent of his forgiveness reaches back to the forgiveness he himself receives from God. For we have to admit with shame the weaknesses in ourselves that have brought us again and again as suppliants to Him. Repeatedly He has forgiven us, not seven times but seventy times seven. Accordingly there can be nothing calculating in our forgiveness of one another, no question of 'How far am I prepared to go?' The Church, founded upon God's reconciling love and with the message of reconciliation committed to it, must itself be a compelling illustration of unremitting forgiveness.

Through forbearance and forgiveness therefore the Christian community is kept ready for its Lord's use and His coming. For patience looks towards the future when reconciliation shall be complete. As the accredited attire of the Christian here on earth patience is also one of the royal robes of heaven. Put on therefore the garment of patience, the distinctive apparel of the chosen of God.

SEPTUAGESIMA

The Call to Endurance

BY THE REVEREND JOHN L. KENT, M.A.,
CATHCART, GLASGOW

'So fight I, not as one that beateth the air: But I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection.'—1 Co $9^{26.\ 27}$.

The Christian life is an intense battle for the integrity of one's soul, a warfare to be waged with deadly and unrelaxing tenacity. So Paul says.

But this does not sound like the great Apostle. Surely he is contradicting himself. His distinctive message is diametrically opposed to the truth in these words. As Professor J. S. Stewart has put it, 'For me, Paul would say, religion began on the day when I ceased straining and striving and struggling for heaven's favour, and was content to bow my head and accept the gift I could never win.' The Christian life is not a battle but a surrender.

This is the message we have identified with the Apostle Paul and for whose statement of it the Christian Church will be for ever grateful. How, then, can he reconcile this with the words of our text?

One thing is plain. Whatever Paul means, he has not deviated one step from the fundamental truth that the essence of the gospel rests in God's offer of reconciliation with Himself through His Son our Saviour, the Lord Jesus Christ. Nothing we can become or perform can merit this status. It is all the doing of God.

This fact having been recognized, accepted and acted upon, what follows? Surely this. The Christian is under a constant sense of infinite gratitude and obligation.

> Love so amazing, so divine,
> Demands my soul, my life, my all.

'I don't bruise myself,' says Paul, 'to appease the wrath or gain the favour of God. He is entitled to the best that I can do and be. Therefore I fight and keep myself in subjection.'

For the Christian, reconciled by the infinite grace of God, life, in consequence, involves *conflict*. 'So fight I.' The very gospel that makes him what he is provokes the hostility of the world. The natural

man does not want to believe that he cannot win his own salvation. He has been given a brain to plan it and a will to carry it out. Away with your pious and degrading fantasies that all is of God! Thus what a Christian fundamentally believes sets him in opposition to the world. Immediately he accepts God's grace and gives utterance to his thankfulness the fight is on.

This becomes the more clear when he sees the powers of evil striving to win the throne of the world. Says a character in Somerset Maugham's *The Narrow Corner*, 'I am not willing to accept evil and injustice and ugliness. I am not willing to stand by while the good are punished and the evil go scot free.' Nor is the Christian. By the gospel that has claimed him, the Christian is committed to do combat with the forces of darkness that have ranged themselves against the kingdom of light.

The Christian knows that he is engaged in a deadly conflict not merely because immediately he witnesses for his faith he is brought face to face with its foes but because he is aware that the battleground is in his own heart. The natural man whom he encounters in the world outside grapples with him in his soul. The gospel incites us to rebellion. Nobody knew this better than the Apostle himself. Insidious evil is ever whispering its doubts and denials in our ears. 'Look,' it says, 'does it appear as if your Christian ways are successful? Glittering prizes don't come your way. Ease up, you are being too severe with yourself. After all, you are just human. Don't accuse yourself.'

When the Christian realizes that he is engaged in mortal combat, he knows that his security and success depend on his *self-discipline*. 'I keep my body under.' If there was one thing on which the Lord Jesus Christ laid an emphasis, it was this. 'Whosoever will come after me, let him deny himself, and take up his cross, and follow me.'

Not that there is any virtue in self-denial in itself. That merely leads to a distortion of the soul. Yet too many Christians have given the world this impression. They make the Christian life appear dull, drab and grey.

No. The value of our self-control and denials is determined by the objectives we set ourselves. The athletes in the Greek games practise the same kind of discipline as mine, says Paul, but they do it for a corruptible crown, but I for an incorruptible.

Here is where so many of us fail. We agree with the high aims of the Christian faith. We desire to find rest for our souls in the fellowship of God and in the consolations of His love. But we boggle at the cost.

That is why our religion makes such an ineffective impact upon the world and is so unsatisfying to ourselves. Will there be compensating riches for the impoverishments, more durable satisfactions for those we surrender? Will the triumph of the cause justify all the sacrifices of the campaign? The asking of these questions halts us all but holds too many of us back. Only those who have made self-discipline a settled habit of their Christian life have the courage to break away from the old into the new and prove that this is the way God leads us into a more vigorous and satisfying manhood.

We have often wondered why the Lord Jesus Christ chose for His disciples men so slow-witted and commonplace. Perhaps this was His reason. Whatever they lacked, they possessed this essential quality of headlong devotion, a capacity for a service that counted not the cost.

A Christian, however, can only be fully sustained in his conflict if he is equipped with something more than his habit of self-discipline. He must have a faith that expresses itself in an *endurance* that never falters.

While the Apostle never doubted that ultimately the conflict into which his Christian profession had thrown him would culminate in triumph, he did not exclude from his mind the possibility of his failure in it. 'Lest I myself should be a castaway.'

We may believe in our hearts that victory in the long run is assured but the facts of life do not confirm that the triumph is such a foregone conclusion. Indeed, the forces of evil and of the Kingdom appear so evenly balanced that sometimes the conquest looks as if it would be with the Devil and not with God. The surge to and fro of the battle line and the number of reverses suffered are a dire and sometimes desperate test of our faith.

It must be so. If God has claimed us as His redeemed children through Jesus Christ, then we are undergoing the process of becoming His sons and daughters. If life gave an easy endorsement, a facile 'Amen' to our faith, the character being fashioned in the fight would be shallow. Men, said Professor Macneile Dixon, 'rise to their full stature only when challenged. Startle the soul into admiration, ask of it the impossible, to join a forlorn hope and it is endowed with angelic strength.'

Our capacity for this endurance depends finally upon the original trust with which we respond to His offer of grace. When we are enshrouded with doubt so that not one step ahead can we see; when, in the conflict without and within, we are beset with a foe who seems stronger than we can master; when we know the bitterness of defeat, the endurance that will yet save us arises like a flame out of the ashes because our souls are in the custody of Him who knew the deep and dazzling darkness of the Cross.

Contributions and Comments

The Black Arabs of the Jordan Valley

Is perhaps some further light thrown on the identity of the 'ravens' of 1 K 17[6] by the following passage from Mrs. E. A. Finn's *Palestine Peasantry* [1923], 61 f.: 'Occupying the district west and north-west of the Dead Sea, we find a curious tribe of Arabs, a clan who differ from both Bedaween and Fellahheen, and are looked upon as something between the two. They live in black tents, roam over the district, and observe Bedawee customs in most things; but they cultivate the ground, ploughing, sowing, and reaping as do the Fellahheen. They are about one thousand strong, and have numerous flocks and camels'? Mrs. Finn believed these people to be the remnants of ancient Amorites who survived on the west of Jordan (Jg 1[34ff.]). *Pace* Montgomery in the *I.C.C.*, the identification of Cherith with Wady el-Kelt seems perfectly reasonable (being a sufficiently inaccessible hiding-place), and of course it fits this description admirably.

J. W. Wenham

Bristol

Did Jesus Speak Greek?

In the September, 1956, issue of The Expository Times (lxvii. 383) the Rev. A. W. Argyle, in the attempt to substantiate the thesis of an earlier note, appeals to the authority of Dalman for the statement that when 'the kingdom' is used in Jewish writings without further definition it always means 'the secular government for the time being.' 'As Dalman concludes, therefore,' he says, 'the Greek here is definitely not Semitic.' What Dalman actually wrote, however, was: 'As Jesus always uses, except in the instances given, fuller expressions, it should not be assumed that even for Him "the sovereignty" has as yet become an equivalent term for "the sovereignty of God." Within the Christian community, and specially the Greek-speaking part of it, this identification is more credible. *And in it the terms used by Matthew will have been formed*' (*The Words of Jesus*, 96; italics mine). Which is a very different thing.

Moreover, neither Dalman nor Mr. Argyle appears to have observed that of the four cases cited three contain the required definition in the context, one indeed in the preceding verse (Mt 8[11-12]). Admittedly in the other two the context is more remote, but in the Gospel as we now have it Mt 13[19] appears in a speech containing the exposition of the Parable of the Sower, and this speech begins (13[11]) with the words 'To you it is given to know the mysteries *of the kingdom of heaven*.' Matthew 13[38], again, occurs in the explanation of the Parable of the Tares, where the definition is contained in the Parable itself (13[24]), to say nothing of two other occurrences of the fuller phrase in *vv.* 31 and 33. It is surely not too much to suggest either that even a Jewish writer need not have employed the fuller expression when his meaning was already clear from the context; or that Matthew in editing his material may have conformed to Greek rather than to Jewish usage. For the one remaining case (Mt 24[14]), no such explanation is possible, and in fact we have in the context 'Nation shall be raised up against nation, and kingdom against kingdom,' but this one case in isolation loses much of its force. It seems much more probable (with Dalman) that 'the gospel of the kingdom' reflects the thought of a later period.

On Mt 5[39-40] Mr. Argyle refers to Is 50[6-8] in the LXX, observing that the Hebrew is very different and that if Jesus based His saying on the Hebrew of Isaiah He could hardly have uttered the saying recorded by Matthew at all. Here it was surely incumbent upon Mr. Argyle to elaborate the somewhat dogmatic assertion of his earlier note, and indicate the differences between the LXX and the Hebrew upon which he bases his statement. The earlier note merely lists five key-words and continues: 'The Hebrew is quite different, and Jesus could not have obtained the same sequence of phrases from it.' The coincidence of these five words is certainly striking, and the influence of LXX upon the tradition at some point is to be assumed; but this need not mean that this influence was already operative in the original saying. In the first place, it is *not* a quotation; what in Isaiah is descriptive is in Matthew transformed into an injunction. And, secondly, the words do not occur either in the same form or in the same order. Matthew has ἀντιστῆναι in the infinitive first, followed by ῥαπίζει, στρέψον, and κριθῆναι, whereas Isaiah has ῥαπίσματα, ἀπέστρεψα, and κρινόμενος, with ἀντιστήτω in the imperative last. In Matthew σιαγόνα (acc. sing.) follows ῥαπίζει; in Isaiah σιαγόνας (acc. plur.) precedes ῥαπίσματα.

It should be noted that C. H. Dodd includes Is 50[4-11] in a list of primary sources of testimonia (*According to the Scriptures*, 108). On Is 50[6] he notes (*ib.*, 91): 'This verse is echoed in descriptions of the sufferings of Christ,' but apparently makes no reference to Mt 5[39-40]. It may be that

this offers the clue to a solution. That Jesus should have echoed Isaiah is not in the least surprising, nor is there any difficulty in the suggestion that some early Christian, perhaps the evangelist himself, recognized the echo of a passage familiar from its use among other testimonia, and accordingly employed the vocabulary of that passage in rendering the saying into Greek. It may be added that Mr. Argyle's theory would have repercussions upon Synoptic criticism: if the saying were originally uttered in Greek, it must have been to a Greek-speaking audience. The theory might well create more problems than it solves.

Incidentally, if Mr. Argyle is right, Jesus was not bilingual, but at least trilingual. There are fairly good grounds for holding that the Words of Institution at the Last Supper were spoken not in Aramaic but in Hebrew (see Black, *An Aramaic Approach to the Gospels and Acts*[2], 268f., and Jeremias in *Göttingische Gelehrte Anzeigen* [1956], 7).

R. McL. Wilson

St. Mary's College, St. Andrews

The New-Born King (Matthew ii. 2)

In general the style of St. Matthew's Greek is regular and consistent throughout. But in a few instances it departs from the normal practice which the Evangelist appears to have observed, with interesting results.

One of these rules concerns the participle used attributively in connexion with an articular substantive. Normally the position is: article, substantive, article, participle, additional matter (if any): for example, *ὁ πατήρ σου ὁ βλέπων ἐν τῷ κρυπτῷ*.[1] This is the case even where there is no additional matter in close connexion with the participle which would render it advisable in any case to follow the practice of avoiding the pre-substantive position. Thus we have *τὰ πρόβατα τὰ ἀπολωλότα* (10[6], where *τὰ ἀπολωλότα πρόβατα* would not be clumsy), *τοῦ θεοῦ τοῦ ζῶντος* (16[16] 26[63]). One exception to this rule (*τῆς μελλούσης ὀργῆς*, 3[7]) may be due to St. Matthew's source (cf. Lk 3[7]), or more probably to the stereotyped nature of the phrase; we have the Septuagintal *ὁ μέλλων αἰών* (Is 9[6 (5)]) and the Pauline *ἡ μέλλουσα δόξα* (Ro 8[18]) and *ἡ μέλλουσα πίστις* (Gal 3[23]) as well as *τὰ μέλλοντα ἀγαθά* (He 9[11]) in the Early Church.[2]

It is the remaining exceptions which are interesting, in that they occur exclusively in those sections of the Gospel which have sometimes been described as 'legendary' and which are peculiarly Matthæan.

[1] 6[4]. Cf. also 7[13-14] 10[6] 11[21] 16[16] 18[6-13] 21[9] 25[41] 26[3-63] 27[44].

[2] But admittedly *ἡ ὀργὴ ἡ ἐρχομένη* in 1 Th 1[10].

Moreover, the Evangelist keeps rigidly to his new rule in these sections, except in 25[41] (*τὸ πῦρ τὸ αἰώνιον τὸ ἡτοιμασμένον τῷ διαβόλῳ . . .*) which is hardly a case in point for he desires to use also the attributive *τὸ αἰώνιον* and therefore the second lengthy attributive could hardly be placed very elegantly between the article and the substantive. These peculiarly Matthæan passages are: the Birth Narrative (*τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος*, 2[7]), the *Stater* in the Fish's Mouth (*τὸν ἀναβάντα πρῶτον ἰχθύν*, 17[27], where even the additional adverb does not prevent the observance of the new rule), the Last Judgment (*τὴν ἡτοιμασμένην ὑμῖν βασιλείαν ἀπὸ καταβολῆς κόσμου*, 25[34]), and the Resurrection of the Saints (*τῶν κεκοιμημένων ἁγίων*, 27[52]).

I do not know why the Evangelist's style changes in this way during these particular sections, unless the phenomenon indicates the use of a different source in Greek. However, it does throw some light on the construction *ὁ τεχθεὶς βασιλεὺς τῶν Ἰουδαίων* which occurs in one of these very sections (the Birth Narrative, 2[2]). It is possible to take *ὁ τεχθείς* independently as virtually a substantive, as many versions and translators do (for example, A.V., R.V., R.S.V., Rieu, and Knox by way of the Vulgate,) and to render *He that is born King of the Jews*, or something of that kind, with *βασιλεύς* understood predicatively or as another substantive in apposition. However, the fact that this construction occurs in these sections, and especially in close proximity with that construction which we have discussed in 2[7] (*τοῦ φαινομένου ἀστέρος*), makes it highly probable that the construction is once again: article, attributive participle, substantive; and that the translation should be literally *the born King of the Jews*, and more freely but correctly (in view of the aorist) *the new-born King of the Jews*, with Goodspeed and Moffatt.

At first it would seem to be merely a matter of the niceties of grammar, since there is very little difference between *the new-born King* and *He that is born King*. Actually there is a great deal of difference in the emphasis. In the first case, the astrologers ask where to find that great One who has just been born. It is not so much *who* the Person is, as *where* He is, that matters to them at the moment of their question. They are concerned because He has just been born, and it is somewhere near. 'Where,' they ask, 'is the new-born King?' The second rendering is pompous and unreal, for it lays the stress on the destiny which awaits the Baby, and is inferior in dramatic power.

It is probably too much to hope that Charles Wesley and the rest owe to grammatical considerations their phrase, 'Glory to the new-born King!'

Nigel Turner

Diseworth, near Derby

Luke, the Critical Evangelist

By the Reverend John Baker, B.A., B.D., Sutton Coldfield

While it is true that the Christian Church was born in a mighty experience whose content was highly emotional, the more thoughtful believers were aware of the necessity of proving that the foundations of the gospel they preached were not merely emotional.

This cooler view is more apparent in the writings of the third generation of Christians—the Apologists. But it would be a mistake to imagine that the earlier Christians were unaware of the need to vindicate the truth of the gospel on the grounds of factual proof in history, and to demonstrate its ability to meet the claims of reason.

While Matthew may have been intent on proving that the gospel fulfilled Jewish prophecy, and Mark offered the all-powerful Son of God to Roman readers who believed in 'things done,' it is also true that Paul saw the wider challenge of philosophical thinking, and John sought to link up the personal mysticism of faith with the metaphysical speculation of his age.

These men who were so involved in the battles of the Early Church did not, as some would have us believe to-day, merely fling a paradoxical ultimatum in the face of their age, and violate the rational human mind with an uncompromising 'either-or.' They lived *in* their time, and they sought to bring men and women to terms with the gospel which had to do with man as a creature of reason, will, and emotion, and they sought also to prove how satisfying was that gospel on every count.

The Evangelist who appears to be most aware of this is Luke, and we find in him, I believe, a more critical approach to the material at his disposal, and a strong awareness that the gospel which Jesus proclaimed, and which he himself embodied, could stand firm in the face of the demands of reason and good sense.

Luke was a Greek, and this fact may account for the noticeably 'reasonable' attitude which he takes in setting down his material, and in the particular emphasis which he lays on certain aspects of our Lord's teaching. For Luke is strongly aware of the logical force of the gospel, and he sees Christ as One who took pains to make men see the reasonableness, the inherent truth, of what He said and did. In fact, it might be said that Luke wrote with one eye on the rational man of his age, on the cultured, and even on the sceptical, reader.

What is the evidence for this? We cannot give here a full critical statement, but must choose certain points which seem to us to reveal this Lucan characteristic.

The clearest evidence of this is naturally to be found in those sections of the Gospel which are peculiar to Luke alone, *i.e.* 'L.' But there is also much that is significant in the way that Luke adapts Mark and Q—in little hints and turns of phrase.

Before we pass on to the main body of the Gospel, however, we must comment briefly on a few points in chs. 1–3.

In spite of the uncertainty of some of his historical references both in the Gospel and in Acts, there is no doubt that Luke is making a deliberate attempt to establish the historicity of his writings. In all good faith he wishes to emphasize the *dependability* of his account. This is clear in the prologue to his Gospel where we sense that Theophilus, whether he be a known person or the general reader, is seen by Luke as a man of culture and intelligence, a man who will expect to have the evidence put before him logically, and 'in order.' Luke stresses the fact that this is the evidence of eye-witnesses whom he can guarantee, and that he can vouch for the truth of this evidence, since he has had 'thorough understanding of all [these] things from the very first.' There is no mistaking the force of ἀκριβῶς here—'accurately, exactly.' Here we see a man giving a guarantee of his integrity at the bar of truth. However strong the faith he holds, Luke is determined that his account of the life of his Lord shall be as unbiassed as he can make it, depending for its effect upon the power of the truth, and its appeal to man's reason. And he does this, we believe, with the awareness of a critical, logical mind.

Whatever may be our personal assessment of the truth of the Birth Narratives in the first two chapters, they were regarded by Luke as genuine, and the whole account is a careful, and, within its scope, a consistent account of the stories received by him. We do not know the source of these narratives. But it is clear that Luke must have accepted their authenticity, and having so far let his 'faith o'erleap the confines of his reason,' he gives us a close-knit account, without loose thinking.

When we come to the incident of the twelve-year-old Jesus in the Temple, are we mistaken in finding there a deliberate emphasis on His intellectual growth? In ch. 2^{47} Luke uses the word σύνεσις—a term which stresses rational judgment

and intelligent understanding. This emphasis is made more definite by his use of the word *σοφία* in 2^{52}, 'And Jesus increased in *wisdom*. . . .'

In the main body of the Gospel we can do no more than pick out a few examples.

It is often evident in Luke's account that the purpose of Christ's teaching or healing or forgiving sins is seen to be an appeal to the reason of the person involved—and also, quite frequently, to that of the bystanders. For example, in ch. 14^{6}, 'And they could not answer again to these things.' And in ch. 13^{17}, '. . . all his adversaries were ashamed.' The power of argument, and the logical force of truth are brought out.

It is interesting to note examples of Christ's *method* of teaching, as recorded especially by Luke. This method, while not precisely syllogistic, is nearly so, in form.

In ch. 7^{36-50}, Jesus quietly brings out the inescapable logic of the situation in His words to Simon the Pharisee, 'Tell me, therefore, which of them will love him the most.' As He goes on it is patent that there is no reply that can be given except one of assent.

The conclusion of the Parable of the Good Samaritan is similar (ch. $10^{36, 37}$). 'Which of these three, thinkest thou, was neighbour unto him that fell among thieves?'

Again the Parable of the Rich Man who was a fool moves along similar lines. God speaks to him, 'Thou fool, this night thy soul shall be required of thee; then whose shall those things be, which thou hast provided?'

The answer is clearly implied—an unspoken conclusion—but followed in this case by a more general conclusion, 'so is he that layeth up treasure for himself, and is not rich toward God.'

It is hardly an accident that some of Christ's sayings sound more reasonable in Luke's version. In recording Christ's reference to the weather signs and the signs of the times, Luke carries the implication farther than Matthew by adding, 'Yea, and why even of yourselves judge ye not what is right?'—a pointed reference to His hearers' inability to think straight.

Luke therefore is impressed not only by the wonder of the gospel, but also by its reasonableness. We might, indeed, take as Luke's comment the words in ch. 24^{45}, 'Then he opened their minds to understand the Scriptures,' as Moffatt rightly translates. (Here again Luke uses the word he had used in ch. 2^{47}, *συνιέναι*, in its verbal form.)

Throughout the Gospel we find (and, indeed, throughout Acts also) the same desire to convince men by an appeal to their reason. Even at the beginning of His ministry in the synagogue at Nazareth, Luke alone records how Jesus tried to counter the resentment of the congregation by an argument from their own history, quoting the story of Elijah and the widow of Sarepta, and the prophet Elisha and Naaman the Syrian. Christ here pleads with the people to believe in accordance with their good sense as rational beings.

It is Luke who emphasizes most the need for Christ's followers to think out the implications of discipleship. It is he alone who records Christ's words, in ch. $14^{28ff.}$, 'For which of you, intending to build a tower, sitteth not down first, and counteth the cost, whether he have sufficient to finish it? . . .' 'Or what king, going to make war . . .?'

Luke also brings out Christ's impatience with superficial and sentimental thinking. In ch. 11^{27-28} the bystander's exclamation, 'Blessed is the womb that bare thee . . . ,' brings the sharp and realistic retort, 'Yea rather, blessed are they that hear the word of God, and keep it.'

Again in ch. 14^{15}, when a fellow-guest made the pious comment, 'Blessed is he that shall eat bread in the kingdom of God,' Jesus quickly brought him back to earth with the caustic parable which uncovered the emptiness of men's dreams about the Kingdom (Lk 14^{15-24}).

Finally, we might well ask whether Luke was not exercising a tendency towards higher criticism when he omitted the account of Christ walking on the water, or the incident of the destruction of the barren fig-tree, both of which are recorded by Mark and Matthew. Luke gives us the *Parable* of the Barren Fig-Tree (13^{6-9}) and it may be that he regarded that as the true version of the incident, or possibly as a rational explanation of what is recorded by the other Evangelists.

In the (Q?) passage about the Ninevites and Solomon and the Queen of the South (Lk 11^{24-32}, cf. Mt 12^{38-45}) there is a change in the order, and the words 'For as Jonas was three days and nights in the whale's belly; so shall the Son of man be three days and nights in the heart of the earth' are omitted. There seems little doubt that the source used by both Luke and Matthew is the same, since it is followed verbatim in most parts. Why, then, has Luke omitted a section? Was it, as has been suggested, because he saw no purpose in including what was of interest to Jews alone, and which would be unintelligible to Gentiles? Or was it rather that the part he left out sounded irrelevant and unnecessary to him—as indeed it does to us? There is no doubt that Luke had a keen eye for this kind of thing, and wherever he can he clarifies the accounts he has received so that his readers may the better understand the mind of Christ.

We find an example of this at the close of the brief parable about the danger of putting new

wine into old wineskins (5^{37}), where Luke adds the words 'And no man having drunk old wine desires new; for he saith, The old is better' (5^{39}).

J. Jeremias regards these words as a Lucan addition and says, 'the addition is unfortunate, for, while the parable sets forth the incompatibility of the new wine with the old, the new wine being a symbol of the New Age, the addition emphasizes the superiority of the old. Evidently the addition is due to an entirely external cause, the catchword οἶνος νέος' (*Parables of Jesus*, 80).

Jeremias seems to me to have missed the point. Whether the words are a Lucan addition we cannot say, but their meaning suggests that they are a genuine saying of Christ's—for they are in line with His reiterated complaint that He *cannot get people to accept the new wine*, the New Age. In spite of Christ's offer, men still said, The old is better. One of the greatest hindrances to the success of Christ's ministry was the people's conservatism, their satisfaction with their present condition, with the old wine. This unwillingness of men to relinquish the old life was the point of a number of His parables, and it is this crippling unresponsiveness to the reasonable offer of the gospel which Luke is at pains to bring out in the teaching of Jesus throughout his Gospel.

Luke was critical because he was deeply anxious that the evidence he gave concerning Christ and His gospel should be the truth as far as he knew it, because for him the Kingdom of God was also the Kingdom of truth, and of the open mind.

Recent Foreign Theology

Christian Worship. A study of the basis and structure of worship, by R. Paquier, has appeared in the Swiss series of *Manuels et Précis de Théologie*.[1] The work is divided into three parts, the first dealing with the Divine initiative and summons to experience God's presence and fellowship in His house; the second with man's obedience, and the nature and purpose of worship; and the third with the order of the ordinary and special services, both for the proclamation of the Word and the administration of the Sacraments. The work is written from a Protestant standpoint, and it may be said that in some branches of the Church, where services are bare and formless, it is time that more attention was paid to these questions. To the reviewer one of the most interesting chapters is on vestments. The author traces the growth of a special dress for the clergy from the early Christian centuries, when there was no distinctive dress, to the time when conservatism preserved an obsolete ordinary dress as a distinctive dress. He notes the varying attitudes of the Reformers, and considers the claims of the Geneva gown. This was the academic gown of doctors, and is not specially appropriate either in significance or in colour to the joy that should characterize Christian worship. It has the merit of concealing the body of the preacher more than modern dress, but Paquier desiderates brighter colours, and favours a variety of colours for the varying seasons of the Christian year—green, white and gold, red, and violet, but with the suggestion that perhaps blue might replace red.

The Son of Man in the Gospels. The Swedish scholar, Dr. E. Sjöberg, has published in German a large and learned work on *The Secret Son of Man in the Gospels*.[2] He opens by examining the ideas of the Messianic secret and its unfolding in Jewish apocalyptic writings, including the Dead Sea Scrolls, and in Judaism, before turning to trace this theme through the Synoptic Gospels and their sources and then in the Fourth Gospel. Jesus is held to have been the secret Son of Man in the Gospels, using the term in a broadly eschatological sense, save in such passages as those referring to His sufferings, where His identification of Himself with the Son of Man became apparent, and leading up to His identification of the Son of Man with the Suffering Servant. An Excursus is devoted to a critical examination of the view of Jeremias that the conception of a Suffering Messiah is older in Judaism than the time of Christ. The reviewer has published a paper on this question, but it does not seem to be known to Dr. Sjöberg. One of the strongest arguments against the view seems to be the complete surprise of the disciples at the idea that One whom they supposed to be the Messiah could also be the Suffering Servant, and this argument still stands despite the evidence so far published from the Dead Sea Scrolls. Here Dr. Sjöberg is in fundamental agreement with the reviewer, for he rejects the view of Jeremias, and maintains that the sayings of Jesus about His sufferings were not taken over from a Jewish conception of the Messiah.

Shechem. Eduard Nielsen, of Aarhus, has published an elaborate study of all the Biblical passages referring to Shechem, followed by chapters on Shechem and its Rivals—Gilgal, Bethel, Shiloh, Jerusalem, and Sinai.[3] Three quarters of the book are occupied with the study of the Biblical passages,

[1] *Traité de Liturgique* (*Manuels et Précis de Théologie*, No. 25) [1954]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel; Swiss Fr. 8, or bound 11.

[2] *Der verborgene Menschensohn in den Evangelien* [1955]. Gleerup, Lund; Kr. 30.

[3] *Schehem: a Traditio-Historical Investigation* [1955]. Gad, Copenhagen; 35s.

which are split up into sections, each of which is carefully examined from a text-critical point of view first, and then minutely studied for its contents and its place in oral tradition and its historical substance. Amongst so much detail it is often hard to see the wood for the trees, and it would have helped the reader if clear summaries of the argument had been supplied more frequently. This would have been especially helpful in the matter of the historical substance. For instance, Nielsen maintains that Ephraim and Manasseh entered Canaan by different routes and in different ages, and that a post-settlement alliance between them gave rise to the fiction of the house of Joseph. One of the fundamental principles of the traditio-historical school, to which Dr. Nielsen belongs, is the tenacity and reliability of oral tradition. We might, therefore, have expected to be told where the fiction came from, and why it was necessary to create the Joseph saga to support it ; also whether there was any historical kernel in this fiction, and if so how much. Farther, why is it that the Blessing of Jacob, in Gn 49, speaks only of the tribe of Joseph and does not mention Ephraim and Manasseh as separate units, whereas the Blessing of Moses, in Dt 33, which is generally regarded as much later in origin, presents Ephraim and Manasseh as two divisions of the house of Joseph ? If the older poem had known of the separate tribes and the latter had brought them together as parts of the house of Joseph, Dr. Nielsen's theory might have found here some support ; but as it is we can only wonder. For he adduces no evidence that the two tribes after their concordat ever became one, so that they could be called the tribe of Joseph, as they are in Gn 49. Indeed, he notes their continuing rivalry as evidence that they originally had nothing to do with one another. Where and when, therefore, did the conception of Gn 49 arise ? Again and again the reviewer is left asking questions which are left unanswered, and he would like to see an integrated account of the early history of Israel, as Nielsen conceives it. To say this is not to detract from the merits of this learned study in much of its detailed comments, and subsequent students will come again and again to it with profit, even where they are moved to disagree.

The Post-exilic Prophets and the Cultus. An important study of the post-exilic Prophets of the Old Testament and their relation to the cultus has appeared in the French Roman Catholic series *Bibliothèque de Théologie*, from the pen of Théophane Chary.[1] The author first offers a careful comparison of Ezekiel's Temple with Solomon's, and also with the Temple as envisaged by the Priestly Code and as reflected in the work of the Chronicler. This is followed by an examination of the post-exilic prophets and their attitude to the cultus. Throughout the author accepts the findings of critical scholarship, whose arguments he sets forth to establish the exilic origin of Deutero-Isaiah, the separation of Trito-Isaiah, the post-exilic date of Joel, the distinction between proto-Zechariah and Deutero-Zechariah, and the Maccabaean dating of Daniel. Roman Catholic authors of but a few years ago would have found it difficult to adopt these positions so frankly, and this book is symptomatic of the change which has come over Catholic Biblical scholarship. Dr. Chary shows that these post-exilic prophets were not men who advocated the cultus for its own sake, but that they sought to invest the forms with the spirit for which the pre-exilic prophets called. They were not all men of equal stature, and Trito-Isaiah, in particular, is said to have fallen below the level of Deutero-Isaiah. The whole forms a penetrating study of post-exilic prophecy in full harmony with present-day trends in scholarship.

[1] *Les Prophètes et le Culte à partir de l'Exil* (*Bibliothèque de Théologie*, Série iii. : *Théologie Biblique*, Vol. 3) [1955]. Desclée, Tournai ; Belgian Fr. 150.

Old Testament Theology. To the many books published in recent years on the Theology of the Old Testament a new French work by Professor E. Jacob, of Strasbourg, has now been added.[2] It opens with a useful history of the discipline and an examination of its relation to other sides of Old Testament and theological study, and then proceeds to examine the idea of God presented in the Old Testament, the Divine activity in creation (and especially in the creation of man, whose nature and destiny are considered here), the continuing Divine activity in the government of the world and in history (particularly in the history of the elect people), and the sacred persons and institutions presented in the Old Testament. The final section of the book deals with sin and redemption, the future life and eschatology. This last section is surprisingly compressed, and it would seem that the author attaches less importance to soteriology than to other sides of Old Testament theology. Nevertheless, his book provides a very valuable survey of the teaching of the Old Testament, and its value is enhanced by the bibliographical information given at the beginning of each section. Throughout the work is careful, reliable, and scholarly, and it will add considerably to the reputation of its author.

Czech Biblical Concordance. Few readers of THE EXPOSITORY TIMES are likely to be interested in a

[2] *Théologie de l'Ancien Testament* (*Manuels et Précis de Théologie*) [1955]. Delachaux et Niestlé, Neuchâtel et Paris ; French Fr. 1100.

Concordance to the Czech Bible, and the present writer, who knows no Czech, is not amongst those few. Yet it may seem worth while to record that the first part of such a Concordance [1] has now appeared, and that it has some features which are not shared by any other Concordance known to the writer. We are familiar with concordances which enable us to know the original Hebrew word for an Old Testament passage, or Greek word for a New, by separating all the references according to the word used. Those who use Hatch-Redpath's *Concordance to the Septuagint* are familiar with a different system which enables them to detect by a number placed after each reference the Hebrew word represented by the Greek from a list placed at the head of the entry. The present Concordance follows the latter method, but enables the Czech reader to know at once both the Hebrew word represented in an Old Testament passage, and the Greek word found in the Septuagint of the passage, a number indicating the former and a letter the latter. Clearly a very great deal of work has gone into its preparation, and the English reader may envy the Czech his new tool. The work has been done by a team of two hundred and fifty persons, under the editorship of M. Bič and J. B. Souček.

H. H. Rowley

Manchester University.

[1] *Biblická Konkordance*, part 1, A. to Bezbožný [1954]. Kalich, Prague; US. $1.10.

Entre Nous

Where the Saints Have Trod

The blood of the martyrs has always been the seed of the Church; and never has any community of Christians been so persecuted as the Quakers have been. In April, 1659, alone it is said that two thousand Friends were imprisoned, of whom twenty-one died. Principal D. W. Lambert has collected the stories of nineteen Quaker saints in a book entitled *The Quiet in the Land* (Epworth Press; 7s. 6d. net). These short studies were originally articles in 'The Flame'; but if ever articles deserved to be reprinted these do.

George Fox began it all. In September, 1643, he heard the voice which said: 'Forsake all both young and old and be as a stranger unto all.' The Established Church of the day brought him little help. The advice of one parson to him was: 'Smoke tobacco and sing psalms!' In Sedbergh, for instance, there were 'fourteen ale-houses and a clergyman who was a common frequenter of them all.' It was not from scholarship and divinity that George Fox was to find the light. 'The Lord opened unto me that being bred at Oxford or Cambridge was not enough to fit and qualify men to be ministers of Christ.' So Fox found Christ direct. 'I had no fellowship with any people, priests, or professors, or any sort of separated people, but with Christ, who hath the key, and opened the door of Light and Life unto me.' It was near Derby one day that Fox charged a Justice of the Peace 'to tremble at the name of the Lord,' and from that incident the nickname *Quaker* was born. In this book the characteristics of the Quakers shine out.

Their meetings had something that others did not possess. Thomas Ellwood heard Edward Burrough speak: 'I drank in his words with desire, for they not only answered my understanding, but warmed my heart with a certain heat, which I had not till then felt from the ministry of any man.' Robert Barclay says: 'When I came into the silent assemblies of God's people, I felt a secret power among them that touched my heart.' Thomas Curtis felt the words of George Fox 'as a flash of lightning, they so ran through him.' There is a pleasing practicality in the Quakers. William Penn writes home: 'First, let the fear of the Lord and a zeal and love for His glory dwell richly in thy heart. . . . Secondly, be diligent in meetings for worship and business; stir up thyself and others therein; it is thy duty and place; and let meetings be kept once a day in the family to wait upon the Lord. . . . Thirdly, cast up thy income, and see what it daily amounts to, by which thou mayest be sure to have it in thy sight and power to keep within compass.' William Penn rightly saw nothing incongruous in telling people at one and the same time that they must not drift away from God, and that they must not get into debt. It is a lovely thing to read of John Woolman haunted by the death of a mother robin, and always travelling on foot because the horses pulling the stage coaches were driven so hard.

No one knew better than the Quakers the sword that divides the home. Thomas Ellwood became a Quaker: 'He pleaded humbly with his father: "Let me stay and be your servant. I will do the work of the hired lad for thee. Let me stay."' His father was adamant, and the boy left home to know it no more. Margaret Fell knew that she must either 'displease my husband or offend God.' Mary Hewett says: 'On the ninth of the seventh month, 1825, I left my father's house, without consent or approbation, for the Exeter Circuit, where I felt satisfied that the Lord had sent me.' In truth the Quakers loved Christ more than the dearest ties on earth.

No one had ever a higher ideal of service than the Quakers had. His friend said of Edward Burrough's ten years of life's work: 'He never

spent one week for himself.' Shortly before her death Elizabeth Fry said to one of her daughters : ' My dear, I can say one thing—since my heart was touched at the age of seventeen, I believe I never have awakened from sleep in sickness or health, by day or by night, without my first waking thought being how best I might serve my Lord.' We may well end with Thomas Ellwood's simple poem :

O that mine Eye might closèd be,
To what becomes me not to see !
That deafness might possess mine Ear,
To what concerns me not to hear !
That Truth my tongue might always tie
From ever speaking Foolishly !
That no vain Thought might ever rest,
Or be conceivèd in my Breast !
That, by each Word, each Deed, each Thought,
Glory may to my God be brought.
But what are wishes ! Lord, mine Eye
On Thee is fixt ; to Thee I cry :
O purge out all my Dross, my Tin :
Make me more white than snow within !
Wash, Lord, and purifie my Heart,
And make it clean in every part :
And when 'tis clean, Lord, keep it too ;
For that is more than I can do.

No doubt these stories were familiar to the Friends themselves, but it was an act of true friendship on Principal Lambert's part to make them available to the rest of us. WILLIAM BARCLAY

Congregational Use of the Greater Psalms

When we were planning the winter praise for Victoria Tollcross Church, Glasgow, we were concerned to discover how few psalms suitable for singing in the metrical version could be sung right through as a unity at one standing. Psalms 1, 8, (apart from the last eight lines), 23, 67, 98, 100, 121, 122, 124, 127, 148 and 150 is our complete list of possibles. Even the great favourites, such as Pss 40, 46, 84, 96, 103 and 145 cannot be sung right through ; they are too long in the metrical version. A congregation would soon be out of breath and the monotony of the same tune throughout would kill the life of the diction and thought of the psalm.

Here, of course, is the great argument for the use of the Psalter pointed for chanting. Five or six four-line verses at a time is the congregational limit in the metrical version. But a congregation can conveniently chant a psalm of thirty to fifty two-line verses at one standing. And the argument for the chants can be based on the musical interpretation of the words. It was an organist and choirmaster of the English Presbyterian Church who opened up to me the meaning of Ps 22 and its splendid relevance on the lips of Jesus on the Cross. He set the ' despair ' part of the psalm up to the ' lion ' verse (21a) to a two-line chant in a minor key and the wonderful deliverance and thanksgiving part from the ' unicorn ' verse (21b) onwards to the same tune in the relative major key, bringing out vividly the sense of surprise in the *v.* 21 by changing from minor to major between the first and second lines of the two-line chant.

But there are still psalms which a congregation could not chant right through as a unity. It is not merely a matter of over-all length or monotony of tune. The chant, two- or four-lined, has its own limitations. Into his words the psalmist can put a whole life-time of vision and experience ; the form in which he casts his psalm may run the whole gamut, psychological, spiritual and practical, of a varied service of worship. We may well ask whether a chant can ever adequately interpret such a psalm. Is the chant not too simple, too small to give the singing worshipper any true perspective of the immensity and magnificence of the greater psalms ?

We believe we have found a way of using the greater psalms congregationally as a unity and we are preparing Ps 107 for a praise service. We are following Kirkpatrick's analysis ; first the Opening Thanksgiving, which will be sung by all the choirs and the congregation (*vv.* 1–4) ; second, the Four Pictures of God leading Lost Travellers, freeing doomed Prisoners, saving the Wayward and Guiding Sailors through the storm (*vv.* 5–9, 10–16, 17–22, 23–32) to be sung by the Church, Woman's Guild, Girls' Association and Boys' Brigade choirs respectively, the congregation joining in the refrain that recurs at the end of each section ; third, the Two Point Sermon, that God exalts the humble and that His defence is sure (*vv.* 33–38, 39–42) to be sung antiphonally among the choirs with the congregation singing alternate or concluding verses ; and, finally, the Amen verse (43) to be sung by all.

The Opening Thanksgiving will be followed by prayers of invocation ; the Four Pictures by prayers of intercession ; the Sermon by an ascription and gloria ; and the Amen verse by the benediction. The tunes to be used are four- and eight-line 3/2 and 4/2 common metre arranged so that no setting is followed by one the same length or rhythm, namely : St. Andrew, Martyrs, St. Matthew, Warwick, Petersham, Effingham, St. Asaph, closing with St. Andrew again.

This is, of course, an experiment, but we hope to learn from it how we may effectively bring the greater psalms in their entirety into direct congregational use and experience. JAMES G. LEES

Printed in Scotland by MORRISON & GIBB LIMITED, Tanfield Works, and Published by T. & T. CLARK, 38 George Street, Edinburgh. It is requested that all literary communications be addressed to THE EDITOR, King's Gate, Aberdeen, Scotland.